

The Classical Review

AUGUST 1907

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

LATIN COMPOSITION.

I THINK every one ought to be dissatisfied with the standard of Latin and Greek composition, both at school and college. A piece of composition in any language which is not approximately correct, is, in my opinion, worth little; and one which wins only half marks is practically worthless. What good purpose can be served by an exercise which is half wrong? How can any mental discipline be of value which accepts such a standard? How can any real literary feeling be present in one who knows no more of accident and idiom than to produce such a thing? These paragraphs in which I explain my own thoughts may not meet with the reader's acceptance: but what would the reader think of them if every other sentence were incorrect in some way, and if many of them were a travesty of English idiom? No thoughts so expressed could gain a hearing; all the reader's faculties would be absorbed in roars of laughter.

And yet, worse standards than this are accepted. Thirty-three per cent. is generally counted a pass mark; in many school exercises a mark is given for every word that is right, even if five-sixths or nine-tenths be wrong, and if the whole be a horror. I have known successful teachers, who told their pupils to put dashes if they did not know

anything, and I have seen a dozen lines of English represented in examination after this fashion:

Tum - - - - venire - - quem - - -
- cuius - - - - -
- - et - - - - neque - - - - hoc - - - -

None of us, again, who have had to instruct more advanced pupils, at school or university, but have met constantly with blunders in elementary accident, blunders in syntax, literal translations of English words in place of idiomatic phrases, even sheer stupidities like *Equites Arabici* for Arabian Nights. I suppose many of us schoolmasters regard it as one of the joys of our calling to keep a book of comical answers. I am convinced also, that hardly any but the very best boys or girls have any idea of the effect of rearranging the words in a correct Latin or Greek sentence. The rank and file, the middle forms of public schools, are in a slough of despond.

Is there any cure for this? If not, I for one believe that classical study must do positive harm. The result of the study on those who make such blunders is surely bad; surely it cannot be maintained that those who tolerate them can feel the beauty of the classical authors when they read them, or indeed

that they understand them at all. As soon will I believe that he enjoys and understands a fugue of Bach played on King's College organ, who goes home, and sings a music-hall song, out of tune, to the accompaniment of a cracked piano.

One cause of this state of things is clear: pupils are habitually allowed to go on to the later stages without having mastered the earlier. If 33 per cent. will do for the fifth form, it will doubtless do for the first; time presses, and the boys must go up; no doubt they will soak in the grammar with time. But they don't; the second form has its own quota, and one master relieves his mind by saying hard things of the other: the boys, however, continue to be passing rich on thirty-three per cent. Whom are we to blame, then? The master of the first form, or the boys, or the powers that fix the allotted task for each form? Or nature? perhaps it may be inevitable.

But it will be seen at once that this is not inevitable. If we confine ourselves to the simplest vocabulary, accidence, and idiom, it is possible to attain accuracy. This may imply that we do not at first read classical authors, but very simple pieces of Latin written by Englishmen, or by Corderius or Erasmus, and that we exercise our pupils in very simple expressions of thought. I believe that this, even if no more were possible, would be better intellectually than to read Virgil with understanding of thirty-three per cent., and to write Latin prose of the same standard. But much more is possible.

Our problem is partly dependent on time: if therefore we can find a way which saves time, we shall be able to do more. Now it takes about five times as long to write as to speak; if then we do our practice work by speaking instead of writing, we shall be able to advance a good deal faster. The method of oral question and answer has other advantages. When a pupil has laboriously hammered out some sentence, and carefully written it down, it leaves an impression far stronger than the master's correction, even if that be followed by a correct writing. I urge that the mistakes should be made orally, and instantly corrected by the master; then the correct phrase to be repeated by the boy and by the

whole form in chorus; but nothing to be put down on paper until there is good likelihood of the result being quite right. Secondly: there are in conversation a number of small changes which make it necessary for each party to keep his intelligence active. If I ask, *Quid facis?* the answer is not *quid facis*, repeated parrot-wise, but (say) *nihil facio*, or *scribo*, or what not. Thirdly: it is possible by question and answer to make clear from the first the essential structure of an inflected language, as depending for emphasis on the order of words; and this lies at the root of style. Thus a simple sentence may give matter for several questions. Take *Caesar Labienum laudat*. I may ask, *Quem laudat Caesar?* Answer: *Labienum laudat Caesar*. Question: *Quid facit Caesar?* Answer: *Laudat Labienum Caesar*. If all the texts read are treated in this way, the pupils become used to correct accidence, syntax, and order, and learn the elements of style. If again the teacher will condescend to use words which may not often meet him in the inspired vocabulary of Caesar, he has to hand in the daily business of the classroom a means of practice, which will enable him easily to drill his form in all the common constructions of syntax. Instead of, 'Open the window, Smith,' why not say, *Faber, aperi fenestram?* And as Smith does it, let him say, *Aperio fenestram*. Then we may proceed as follows: *Quid dicis? Dico me aperire fenestram. Ludovice, quid dicit Faber? Se fenestram aperire dicit Faber. Balbe, quid dixit Ludovicus? Fabrum fenestram aperire dixit Ludovicus*. All this is a clear gain: for the time would otherwise have been spent without a word of Latin. And more is possible still. *Tu, quid est tibi nomen? Nomen est mihi Alexandro. Scisne quid fecerit Faber? Scio quid fecerit Faber. Quare aperuit fenestram? Ut aer iniret; ne suffocaremur; ne moreremur*. At the end let all be tested by writing, until they know the rules perfectly, which they soon will.

These exercises are all exercises in accidence and syntax; the vocabulary is small, and well known. To increase vocabulary, other means must be taken; but my object has been to show, how a class of average boys may be led to express simple ideas in correct

and idiomatic Latin: more complex ideas must be treated in another way. For this purpose, and for new words, the reproduction of a story is very useful. Any simple story will do, but it should have a point, and be such as to interest the pupils. I would tell the story in simple sentences, asking the class to repeat what is said in one shape or another, with strict orders that no boy shall let anything pass that he does not understand, whether word or construction. I give a few sentences as an example, from the story of the tailor who pricked the elephant's trunk with his needle.

Master. Solebat aliquando elephantus quidam cottidie iter facere praeter tabernam. Quid faciebat?

Boys. Iter faciebat praeter tabernam.

M. Quando?

B. Cottidie.

M. Dicite igitur quid factum sit.

B. Elephantus quidam cottidie praeter tabernam iter faciebat.

M. In hac taberna sedebat sartor.

A Boy. Nescio quid sit sartor.

M. Scribe tu in tabula. [*A boy writes it on the board.*] Sartor is est, qui sarcit vestimenta: sarcio, sarcire, sarsi, sartum. An comprehenditis?

Boys. Non comprehendimus quid dicas.

M. Anglice *tailor*. Quis est igitur sartor?

B. Is qui sarcit vestimenta, sartor est.

M. Ubi sedebat?

B. In taberna sua sedebat.

M. Ita: sedebat in taberna sua sarcians vestimenta. —Now combine those two sentences.

A Boy. Solebat elephantus quidam iter facere cottidie praeter tabernam.

M. —tabernam—

The Boy. Solebat elephantus quidam iter facere praeter tabernam, in qua sartor sedebat sarcians vestimenta.

In the same way, all the logical connexions are brought out: first simple sentences are given, then two combined, then more if

necessary; and finally the class write out the whole, each in his own way, but with instructions to include (say) relative clauses, a *cum*-clause, purpose, consequence, or whatever the master's plan may have been. By degrees the amount of help is decreased, until the outlines of a story only are given, to be filled in; or a theme to be discussed, or an event described.

Now, and not before, I would present to the boys a new problem, in the shape of a piece of English to translate into Latin. The piece should not include constructions which have not been used already in the reproductions or free compositions; and especial care should be taken not to give for translation turns of idiom which express any thought that has not been already expressed at some time by the boy. If this be impossible, the master should tell the boy how to treat the new idiom. The same may be generally said of vocabulary; but that does not matter so much as idiom, since the possible mistakes would not be so bad.

How far this plan could be carried we cannot tell without trying; but I believe it might be carried very far. At any rate, a set of exercises can be produced by average schoolboys of fifteen, which are approximately correct: there may be three or four mistakes on the average, and several pieces will be quite perfect. Our chief hindrance is lack of material; but the boy's command both of vocabulary and idiom may be very greatly enlarged by a certain treatment of the textbooks that are read. This must be reserved for another occasion.

W. H. D. ROUSE.

GREEK LITERATURE AS ILLUSTRATING HISTORY.

THE article by Freiherr von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff in the February number of the *Class. Rev.* on the teaching of 'Greek in the Public School' raises a vital question. The traditional theory of classical teaching in England depends for its validity upon the importance of scholarship in a general secondary education. The article in question boldly proposes to abandon the pursuit of

linguistic subtlety and to replace it by something more closely related to life. Many will be prepared to believe that the permanence of Classics in the Public School curriculum depends upon some such change of attitude. Without in any way desiring to minimise the value of accurate scholarship, it may well be argued that it is essentially the pursuit of the specialist and therefore

unsuited to form the pivot of secondary education.

But this does not necessarily imply the abandonment of Classical study: it only involves a change in method. It will probably be admitted in general terms that our aim should be to produce not 'learned men and dilettanti—but philosophers in Plato's sense.' Yet, if one may venture to question so eminent an authority, the substitute proposed seems not entirely satisfactory. In particular the sections devoted to Natural Science, Mathematics, and Hygiene seem open to criticism. Sections IV, V, and VI confessedly abandon all claim to linguistic beauty, but do they supply us with an efficient substitute from an educational point of view? For Classics neither should nor can be the handmaid of Science: the classic will deplore the debasement of his subject, while the scientist will entirely repudiate the alliance.

But if sections IV, V, and VI were erased, there would be no difficulty in supplying their places: for surely the section allotted to history is inadequate. Teaching History (especially Ancient History) by the biographical method has much to recommend it. Boys are naturally interested not in causes but in persons, and from this point of view the purely classical curriculum may well be regarded as neglect of an opportunity. To the average Public School-boy Caesar is apt to figure merely as the author of the *De Bello Gallico* or at most as the invader of Britain. But the man should come first:

especially as the personality of Caesar is one that cannot fail to attract any lad of ordinary imaginative powers.

Applying this attitude to Section II in the proposed Reader, it is surely fair to maintain that the treatment of history is inadequate. The employment of the biographical method does not preclude continuity, and a practically continuous history possesses an educational value wholly impossible in a few isolated biographies. Of course the teacher can always do something to fill in the gaps, but those in the paragraph referred to are too considerable to be readily supplied in this way.

Again is it not a mistake to carry so far the avoidance of dialectical form? It is true that the objections to a mere *ex cathedra* statement (e.g. that *λόγος* is the Doric equivalent for the Attic *λόγους*) are serious, but the literature which is excluded by a rigid adherence to this principle is surely a greater loss.

Finally it seems almost a pity to introduce Roman history into a Greek Reader, when the claims of Greek history are so hard to satisfy. Why should not Roman history form the basis of a similar Latin Reader? This will leave an adequate space for the treatment of the sister subject, which in these circumstances could be made at once sufficiently interesting to attract, and sufficiently coherent to educate. The amendment proposed might take the following form: Expunging sections IV, V, and VI section II might read as follows:—

II.—GREEK HISTORY.

1. The Heroic Age *Iliad*: Selected episodes, e.g. Achilles' sorrow for Patroclus. The Death of Hector.
2. The Dorian Invasion Hdt. ix. 26.
3. The Legislators Solon: Arist. 'Αθ. Πολ. 2. 3. 5-12.
Poems 1. 2. 3. 9. 32. 36, *Anthologia Lyrica*, Teubner.
4. The Tyrants Greek hatred of the name.
Theognis 891-894; 1203-1206, *Anth. Lyr.*, Teubner.
Peisistratus: 'Αθ. Πολ. 14-17.
Periander: Hdt. v. 92. Speech of Corinthian Ambassadors.
5. The Persian Wars Thuc. i. 128-138. [Pausanias.]
Aeschylus' Epitaph.
Salamis: Aesch. *Persae*, 290-470.
Plutarch *Themistocles*, Selections; *Aristides*, Selections.
6. The Delian League Plutarch *Aristides*, Selections.
7. Spartan and Athenian characters (a) Spartan: Tyrtæus 13 [*Anth. Lyr.* Teub.];
(b) Athenian: Pericles' Speech, Thuc. ii. 60-64.

8. The Peloponnesian War. . . . Pericles : Thuc. ii. 65.
 [Campaign in the north-east]. Brasidas : Thuc. iv. 78-81.
 [The Episode of Sphacteria]. Cleon : Thuc. iv. 27-41.
 [The Sicilian Expedition]. . . Alcibiades : Thuc. vi. 9-18.
9. The Spartan Supremacy Lysander : Plutarch, Selections.
10. The Theban Supremacy Epaminondas, in Plutarch's *Life of Pelopidas*.
11. Philip of Macedon Demosthenes *Philippics*, Selections.
12. Alexander the Great. . . . Arrian vii. 8-11, 24-30.

While claiming that such a scheme satisfies the contentions elaborated above, it is not intended to be exhaustive or inelastic. Does not the teaching of history demand free exercise of individuality as much as or even more than any other subject? Interest on the part of the teacher is the only guarantee for the interest of his pupils: and to display this interest in the most convincing fashion the

teacher must be allowed considerable latitude in the treatment of his subject. The scheme is merely intended to illustrate the practicability of a continuous reading of Greek History based upon the biographical method—an attempt to strike the mean between a cumbersome volume and inadequate treatment of the subject.

WALTER S. HETT.

ΣΥΚΟΦΑΝΤΗΣ.

THE origin of the term *συκοφάντης* is one of the small but unsolved problems of classical philology. It was indeed regarded as something of a puzzle even in the fourth century B.C. For Alexis in his comedy *The Poet* wrote:

The name *fig-shower* is not rightly used
 Of scoundrels. No, the first part *fig-* should be
 The mark of a man both innocent and sweet.
 But this sweet innocent is nowadays
 Tacked on to a scoundrel, and we wonder
 why.¹

Three different answers to the riddle were propounded by the learned in ancient times. (1) Istros, the pupil of Kallimachos, who published his *Attika* about the year 200 B.C., stated in it that dried figs were not exported from Attica but retained for home consumption and that, when many smugglers were informed against (*ἐνεφανίζοντο*), those who denounced them to the dikasts were dubbed *συκοφάνται*.² Plutarch *à propos* of a law of Solon, which forbade the exporting of any Attic produce except oil and threatened the offender with the archon's curse, remarks:

¹ Alex. *ap.* Athen. 74 E-F = Meineke *F.C.G.* iii. 468 f.

² Istr. *ap.* Athen. 74 E = Müller *F.H.G.* i. 423.

'Hence we should not dismiss as wholly incredible the view of those who say' what Istros said.³ And the same view is recorded by sundry other grammarians and lexikographers.⁴ (2) Philomnestos in his work *On the Rhodian festival of the Sminthia* advanced a second explanation: 'The word *συκοφάντης* is derived from the fact that in those days fines and taxes took the form of figs, wine, and oil, on the proceeds of which the state conducted its affairs. Those who demanded these payments in kind and handed them over to the state (*εἰσφαίνοντας*) they called, as it appears, *συκοφάντας*, choosing for the purpose the most trustworthy of the citizens.'⁵ (3) Suidas has yet another view: 'When a famine arose in Attica, certain persons plucked the figs that were sacred to the gods. Afterwards, on the return of plenty, others accused them. So this was the origin of the word *συκοφάντης*.'⁶

³ Plut. *v. Sol.* 24.

⁴ *Et. mag.* 733, 42 ff. *s.v.* *συκοφαντία*, *Et. Gud.* 514, 22 ff. *s.v.* *συκοφαντεῖν*, Suid. *s.v.* *συκοφαντεῖν*, Phot. *lex. s.v.* *συκοφαντεῖν*, Bekk. *anecd.* 304. 30 ff. *s.v.* *συκοφαντεῖν*, schol. *Ar. Plut.* 31, Eust. *Od.* 1495, 16 f.

⁵ Philomn. *ap.* Athen. 74 E = Müller *F.H.G.* iv. 477.

⁶ Suid. *s.v.* *συκοφάντης*.

Suidas' notion appears elsewhere¹ and might be brought into connexion with known religious usage. For figs are associated with a variety of deities and festivals, e.g. Demeter,² Zeus Σικασίος³ or Μελίχιος,⁴ Dionysos Σικεάτης,⁵ Σικίτης⁶ or Μελίχιος,⁷ Hermes,⁸ Priapos,⁹ the Horai,¹⁰ Helios,¹¹ and again the Plynteria,¹² the Thargelia,¹³ the Brauronia,¹⁴ the Hyakinthia.¹⁵

But the rock on which all these ancient derivations make shipwreck is the analogy of the word *ieroφάντης*, which goes far towards proving that the second element in the compound meant not 'one who shows up or informs against' but simply 'one who shows or exhibits.' The same consideration, among others, will not let us argue from Theokritos' *σύκιναι ἄνδρες*¹⁶ or the like to *συκοφάντης* in the sense of 'a worthless informer.' Indeed it is doubtful whether

even the uncompounded *φάντης* was ever used to denote 'an informer.'¹⁷

The view put forward by Mr. Lancelot Shadwell, *viz.* 'that the word properly meant a fig-shewer, i.e. one who brings figs to light by shaking the tree . . . and then, metaph. one who makes rich men yield up their fruit by false accusations and other vile arts'¹⁸ gives a more natural sense to *-φάντης*, but seems somewhat fanciful and far-fetched, and is hardly established by the occasional juxtaposition of *σείω* and *συκοφαντῶ*.¹⁹

But, failing these explanations, in what direction are we to look? Just a century has gone by since J. F. Boissonade complained *De Sycophantis omnia fere jam sunt occupata*,²⁰ and it may be thought presumptuous at this time of day to hazard another guess about so trite a topic. Still, the key of comparative folk-lore has already fitted so many rusty locks that it seems worth while to give it a turn.

One of the commonest prophylactic gestures all round the northern shores of the

¹ Schol. Ar. *Plut.* 31, Philemon *s.v.* *συκᾶς* (cited by Boissonade on Philostr. *her.* p. 320).

² There was at Athens a suburb called *Ἱερὰ Σικῆ*, where Demeter first bestowed a fig-tree on the hero Phytalos. The fruit of this tree was believed to be the earliest example of cultivated fruit and was named *ἡγητορία* (?) or *ἡγήτρια* (?) or *ἡγηρία* (*sic*), presumably because a cake of it called *ἡγητηρία* was carried in the procession of the Plynteria (Paus. i. 37. 2, Philostr. *v. soph.* 2. 20. 3, Athen. 74 D *ἡγητορία*, *Et. mag.* 418, 49 ff. *s.v.* *ἡγητορία*, Eust. *Od.* 1399, 29 ff. *ἡγήτρια*, *ib.* 1964, 11 ff. *ἡγηρία*, Hesych. and Phot. *lex. s.v.* *ἡγηρία*, Hesych. *s.v.* *Ἱερὰ*, Phot. *lex. s.v.* *Ἱερὰ Σικῆ*. See also W. Judeich *Topographie von Athen* München 1905 p. 164).

³ Eust. *Od.* 1572, 56 f. Cp. the myth of Zeus and the Titan *Συκεύς* (Steph. Byz. *s.v.* *Συκαί*, Athen. 78 A-B).

⁴ Roscher *Lex. Myth.* ii. 2558 ff., cp. Athen. 78 C *μελίχα=σῦκα*.

⁵ Hesych. *s.v.* *Σικεάτης*. Dionysos discovered the fig-tree (Sosib. *ap.* Athen. 78 C, *Et. mag.* 455, 30). See further Hesych. *s.v.* *Θουνίδας· ὁ Διόνυσος παρὰ Ῥοδίοις· τοὺς συκίνους φάλητας*.

⁶ Athen. 78 C a Laconian cult, cp. S. Wide *Lakonische Kulte* p. 166 ff.

⁷ Athen. 78 C a Naixian cult.

⁸ Hesych., Phot. and Suid. *s.v.* *σῦκον ἐφ' Ἑρμῆ*.

⁹ Theocr. *ep.* 4. 2, *Anth. Plan.* 240. 1 ff. Philippos, 241. 1 ff. Argentarius, Hor. *Sat.* 1. 8. 1 ff.

¹⁰ Ar. *fax* 1164 ff.

¹¹ Lyd. *de ost.* 45, cp. Plut. *symp.* 4. 2. 1, 5. 9.

¹² *Supra* n. 3.

¹³ A. Mommsen *Feste der Stadt Athen*² Leipzig 1898 p. 468 ff.

¹⁴ Mommsen *ib.* p. 458 f.

¹⁵ M. P. Nilsson *Griechische Feste* Leipzig 1906 p. 129 ff.

¹⁶ Theocr. 10. 45 with schol. Cp. Zenob. 3. 44, Macar. 7. 82 f., 88.



a. Egyptian. b. Neapolitan.

FIG. 1 (½).

Mediterranean and the Levant was and is the thrusting of the thumb between the first and second fingers of the closed hand.²¹ The two amulets in the adjoining cut (fig. 1) are from

¹⁷ See Steph. *Thes. s.v.* *φάντης*.

¹⁸ L. and S. *s.v.* *συκοφάντης*.

¹⁹ *ib.*

²⁰ Boissonade's ed. of Philostr. *her.* Paris 1806 p. 320.

²¹ O. Jahn 'Über den Aberglauben des bösen

my collection and represent the said gesture, one in blue Egyptian porcelain, the other in Neapolitan coral. Greek and Roman examples in ivory, bronze, silver, glass, coral, and



a. from Tyndaris. b. from Kertsch.

FIG. 2.

precious stone have been elsewhere published, e.g. an ivory hand from Tyndaris (fig. 2a)¹ or a bronze hand from a grave at Kertsch

(fig. 2b).² I add, for purposes of comparison, a series of specimens both ancient and modern now preserved in the British Museum (fig. 3).³ The gesture, as Th. Echtermeyer was the first to point out,⁴ is described by Ovid as a protection against ghosts:

signaque dat digitis medio cum pollice iunctis,
occurrat tacito ne levis umbra sibi.⁵

The modern Greeks have recourse to it if any one stares too hard at a child.⁶ The modern Italians use it to avert the evil eye.⁷ In Somerset, Yorkshire, etc. it serves as a protection against witchcraft.⁸ And, speaking generally, we may assert that it is apotropaic or prophylactic in character.

Now this gesture is regularly called 'the fig.' The French say *faire la figue* in the sense of 'mépriser, braver, se moquer.'⁹ The Italians say *far le fiche*.¹⁰ The Spaniards,



FIG. 3 (3).

Reading from the left:—

1. Small with silver mount (no information).
2. Xanten (*castra vetera*), from Houben Collection.
3. Coral (no information).

4. Silver mount (no information).
5. Xanten, as No. 2.
6. Openwork (no information).

Blicks bei den Alten' in the *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der königlich sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig*. Philologisch-historische Classe. 1855 p. 80 f., C. Sittl *Die Gebärden der Griechen und Römer* Leipzig 1890 pp. 102 f., 123, F. T. Elworthy *The Evil Eye* London 1895 p. 255 ff.

¹ Reproduced from O. Jahn *op. cit.* pl. 4, 9, p. 81, cp. C. Sittl *op. cit.* p. 123 fig. 7.

² Reproduced from O. Jahn *op. cit.* pl. 5, 2, p. 41 n. 44 c, p. 81 n. 221, cp. Daremberg-Saglio *Diet. ant.* i. 257 fig. 310, Baumeister *Denkm.* i. 76 fig. 76.

³ For the photograph from which this cut is taken

I am indebted to the courtesy of Mr. R. A. Smith.

⁴ Th. Echtermeyer *Proben aus einer Abhandlung über Namen und symbolische Bedeutung der Finger bei den Griechen und Römern* Halle 1835 p. 32 f.

⁵ *Ov. fast.* 5. 433 f.

⁶ C. Sittl *op. cit.* p. 123.

⁷ *Id. ib.*

⁸ F. T. Elworthy *op. cit.* p. 256.

⁹ É. Littré *Dictionnaire de la langue française* Paris 1863 i. 2. 1669a.

¹⁰ Th. Echtermeyer *op. cit.* p. 32, F. T. Elworthy *op. cit.* p. 257 n. 404 ff., G. Körting *Lateinisch-romanisches Wörterbuch* Paderborn 1901 no. 3730.

hacer la higa.¹ The Portuguese, *dar huma figa*.² The German *inem die Feigen weisen* has the same force.³ And similar phrases are cited from Bohemia and Poland.⁴ I suggest, then, that the Greek *συκοφάντης* meant at first 'one who shows the fig,' i.e. one who makes with his hand the sign known as 'the fig.' To do this before a person or thing was to imply that he or it was an evil to be averted by superstitious means. Hence *συκοφαντεῖν* with an accusative case would connote an insulting assumption that the object of the verb was bad, and might be rendered 'to slander grossly' or 'to misrepresent in an outrageous fashion'—the sense that it commonly bears in extant literature.

The gesture in question had undoubtedly a phallic significance.⁵ And so had the whole group of words denoting figs: cp. *ficus*,⁶ *ficosus*,⁷ *ficetum*,⁸ *marisca*,⁹ *σῦκον*,¹⁰ *συκῆ*,¹¹ *σῦκινος*, *συκάζειν*,¹² *συκάδης*,¹³ and

lastly *συκοφαντεῖν*¹⁴ itself. One is disposed to ejaculate with Demosthenes¹⁵ *πονηρόν, ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, πονηρόν ὁ συκοφάντης καὶ πανταχόθεν βάσκανον καὶ φιλαίτιον*.¹⁶

ARTHUR BERNARD COOK.

P.S.—I regret that I have not been able to consult S. Reinach 'Sycophantes' in the *Revue des Études grecques* xix. 335 ff. The brief summary in the *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift* April 27, 1907, says: 'Führt nach Zurückweisung der früheren Erklärungen das Wort nach Analogie von *ιεροφάντης* auf den alten Kult der Phthaliden in der *ιερά συκῆ* zurück. Der Sykophant hatte auch, gleich dem Hierophantem in Eleusis, alle Frevler und Verdächtigen von der Kultfeier auszuschliessen und wurde so im Laufe der Zeit zum Typus des böswilligen Anklägers.'—A. B. C.

¹ G. Körting *ib.*, cp. V. A. Huber *Skizzen aus Spanien* Göttingen 1828-1833 p. 263.

² C. Sittl *op. cit.* p. 103.

³ Th. Echtermeyer *op. cit.* p. 32, F. Flügel *Deutsch-englisches Wörterbuch* Brunswick 1894 s.v. 'Feige.'

⁴ C. Sittl *op. cit.* p. 103 n. 6.

⁵ See O. Jahn *op. cit.* p. 80 f., C. Sittl *op. cit.* p. 102 f., É. Littré *op. cit.* p. 1669a, G. Körting *op. cit.* no. 3730.

⁶ Mart. *ep.* 1. 65. 4, 4. 52. 2, *C. I. L.* iv. 1820.

⁷ Mart. *ep.* 7. 71. 1 ff., *carmin. Priap.* 41. 4, 50. 2.

⁸ Mart. *ep.* 12. 33. 2.

⁹ Juv. 2. 13, Mart. *ep.* 12. 96. 10.

¹⁰ Ar. *pax* 1350 with schol., *Anth. Plan.* 240. 7 f. Philippos, 241. 5 Argentarius.

¹¹ Archil. *ap.* Athen. 594 D, Ar. *eccl.* 707 ff.

¹² Stratt. *ap.* Athen. 592 D, Hesych. s.v. *συκάζει*.

¹³ Schol. Theocr. 5. 114, where Ahrens reads *συκάδα φησιν* for the vulg. *συκάδῃ φύσιν*: schol. Ambros. 222 (k.) has *συκάδῃ φησιν*.

¹⁴ Plat. com. and Menand. *ap.* Suid. s.v. *συκοφαντεῖν* and *ap.* *Et. mag.* 733, 48 ff. s.v. *συκοφαντία*.

¹⁵ Dem. *de or.* 242.

¹⁶ Since the foregoing article was completed I have seen that C. Sittl, after indicating the phallic character of *die Feige*, remarks in a foot-note (*op. cit.* p. 103 n. 1): 'Es müsste denn sein, dass *συκοφάντης* eigentlich *ὄβριστής* bedeutete.' This in part anticipates my conclusions.

Parallels, more or less close, to the history of the word *συκοφαντεῖν* might be made out in the case of *καταδακτυλίζειν*, *σκιμαλίζειν*, *σκινθαρίζειν*, and the like.

SOPH. *ELECTR.* 724.

ἔπειτα δ' Αἰνιᾶνος ἀνδρὸς ἄστομοι
πῶλοι βίᾳ φέρονσιν, ἐκ δ' ὑποστροφῆς,
τελοῦντες ἔκτον ἔβδομόν τ' ἦδη δρόμον,
μέτωπα συμπαίονσι Βαρκαίους ὄχοις.

The explanation given of the accident in Jebb's edition is as follows. 'Just as he (the Aenian) was passing the goal, his horses bolted. Hence he could not work them quite round into the track. They turned out of the left-ward curve (ἐξ

ὑποστροφῆς), and ran straight on. Meanwhile, one of the two Libyan chariots had swept round the goal in a wider circle, on the Aenian's right. The Aenian's horses dashed head-foremost into the Libyan's team, striking it on the left side.' This explanation is open to several objections. To begin with, it would have been almost, if not quite, impossible for the second chariot to have gained so much during the turn as to present its left side to the bolting team.

In the next place, the horses were less likely to bolt while turning, when a 'strong strain' was being applied to the near rein, than after the strain had been relaxed, and they had been given their heads again in the straight. Finally, the words *μέτωπα συμπαίονσι* are, to say the least of it, not well chosen to describe such an accident as is suggested above.

Taking these words in their natural sense as the key to the true meaning of the passage, I would suggest that what happened was this. The Aenian, who is leading, has got round the post, and is preparing to drive back in the opposite direction to the other competitors, who have not yet finished the sixth round. Directly after the turn has been made (*ἐξ ὑποστροφῆς*, *post flexum*, Linwood) his horses bolt, swerve to the left, and meet the Barcaeian team, the second in the race, front to front. The following six chariots, one after another (*ἄλλος ἄλλον*), crash into and increase the wreck, but the wily Athenian, and Orestes, who was lying back last in the race, pull wide to the right and so avoid disaster. This explanation may possibly have been that of the scholiast in his brief comment, *ἐξ ὑπαντήσεως ἐκείνων ὑποστροφόντων*. Compare the expression *καὶ τὰ μέτωπα συναράττονσιν ὥσπερ οἱ κριοί*. Lucian *Anach.* § 1.

Of course the accident could not have happened in this way had there been anything

in the nature of a *spina*, but I do not believe such things existed in early times. At any rate the Attic vase-painting of the fifth century B.C., referred to in Jebb's note on l. 720 (Panofka, *Bilder Antiken Lebens*, Pl. iii. No. 10, Schreiber, *Atlas of Classical Antiquities*, Pl. xx. No. 10), shows nothing of the kind. I have since found that the above explanation is practically identical with that offered by Musgrave in the Oxford edition of 1800. His note, which is illustrated by two rough diagrams, is as follows. 'Fingamus lineam, quam describere debuerint currus, ellipsin fuisse, cujus duo foci fuerint metae. [Fig.] Jam quid vetat equos Aenianis cursum introrsum flectentes equorum insequentium frontibus occurrisse?' [Fig.]

I may perhaps quote from a letter written by the late Sir Richard Jebb, to whom I sent the substance of this note soon after the appearance of his edition. 'I can only say that I shall carefully weigh your explanation,—and the more willingly, because I have always felt the obscurity of the passage. I quite agree with you about *μέτωπα συμπαίονσι* suggesting that the teams met front to front: that is undoubtedly the most natural sense for the words, and it is a great recommendation of your view that you obtain that sense.'

HERBERT W. GREENE.

Magdalen College, Oxford.

NEWS AND COMMENTS

AFTER this month, Dr. J. P. Postgate will cease to be formally connected with this *Review*. His connexion with it has lasted just nine years, Mr. Marindin having retired in July 1898. It is unnecessary to remind our readers how much the *Review* owes to Dr. Postgate; and we are glad to add that his help and advice will be available in the same generous measure as it has been. The relations of the *Review* and the *Quarterly* will of course remain the same, as they were explained in the February number: that is,

the editors will act in concert, and contributions offered for the one will be considered also for insertion in the other, unless the writers desire otherwise.

The editor would take this opportunity of appealing to schoolmasters for contributions touching upon professional matters. One of these has already been introduced by Mr. Burrows's letter on school books. The question of annotated editions is of great importance, and is worthy of a discussion on

general principles. The debate at the Headmasters Conference two years ago, showed that there was a strong feeling on the matter in many quarters.

Our readers will be interested to hear that the essay on Malaria, on which letters have appeared in this journal, is in type, and will soon be published. It is the joint work of Mr. W. H. S. Jones, Dr. Ellett, and Major Ross: thus both the scholarly and the medical sides of it will be trustworthy. The subject has a value more than antiquarian: the effect of malaria on national character is undoubted; and if it be established that this disease came into Greece about the time of the Peloponnesian War, the deterioration of the national character after that time may partly be accounted for. Conversely, if it be stamped out of modern Greece, we may hope for a strengthening of the modern Greek nation which may benefit the world.

Few of the practices of the emender are more annoying than his habit of posting his happy thoughts to the editor without taking the trouble to ascertain if they have been anticipated. From such, all but omniscient editors should exact a statement that the contributor has made reasonable search to see if he has been forestalled. Then we should be spared such a sight as is presented in the April number of the *Revista di filologia*, where a writer puts forward one of the most famous of Madvig's emendations, the *quid amet* for *quidam et* in Seneca Epist. 89. 4 (see *Advers.* I. p. 28), as if it were a novelty of his own.

The attention of our readers may be directed to a *Memorandum on the Study of Languages* just issued by the Scotch Education Department (Wyman and Sons, Fetter Lane, price 1½d.). This pamphlet is remarkable as the first official publication to regard the study of foreign languages as a whole. It should, indeed have included English (which is issued separately, price 2d.); but apart from that criticism there is hardly any fault to find. The pamphlet sets forth those principles which must equally be observed in teaching all

foreign languages; and in particular, it urges the necessity of an appeal to the ear. In the same connexion, we would refer to Prof. J. E. B. Mayor's speech at the St. Andrews celebration to George Buchanan (George Buchanan: a Memorial, 1506-1906, p. 476).

An Institute of Archaeology and Archaeography has been founded in Moscow, to which the Czar has granted a charter. Archaeography is defined as the science of studying, ordering, and arranging all collections which may be serviceable to Archaeology. Only graduates of a university, Russian or foreign, will be admitted as students; and after a three years' course, a degree of Doctor of Archaeology or Archaeography may be obtained.

M. Uspensky is the Director, M. Visotsky the Secretary, and there is a staff of archaeologists and explorers as professors.

The *Classical Quarterly* for July has been made a double number. This, it is hoped, will render it possible to complete the first volume within the year and to bring its publication in future issues into line with that of the *Classical Review*. The articles are of varied interest—critical, grammatical, historical, literary, archaeological. Mr. Hodgman's 'Verb Forms in Plautus,' Mr. Housman's 'Luciliana,' and Mr. Richards's 'Further Notes on the Greek Comic Fragments' are concluded. The Editor contributes further notes on Lucan VIII. Mr. T. W. Allen discusses the real character of the 'Sons of Homer,' and Miss Matthaei the classification of Roman allies and the meaning and use of the terms *amici* and *socii*. Mr. Tenney Frank in a paper entitled 'Caesar at the Rubicon' gives reasons for believing that Antony has interpolated a passage in Caesar's *bellum civile*. Mr. Garrod discusses four places in Pindar, Dr. Kronenberg emends a series of corrupt passages in the *Moral Epistles* of Seneca, and Mr. Jas. T. Allen propounds a novel view on the Greek Tragic Actor's costume in the 5th century. The reviews include notices of Vattasso's *Uncial Fragments* of Livy (Mr. W. C. F. Walters), Lindblom on *Silius Italicus* (Mr. W. C. Summers), *Commentationes Philologiae Ienenses* (Mr. R. G. Bury), Rodo-

canachi's 'Capitol' by the Director of the British School at Rome, and a review of recent American Doctoral Dissertations in Classics (a list of 46 is given) by Mr. W. A.

Heidel. Summaries of periodicals (General Archaeological and Numismatic) conclude the number.

CORRESPONDENCE

MR. LANG'S *HOMER AND HIS AGE*.

I MUST apologise to Mr. Lang and to the readers of the *Classical Review* for having delayed so long to answer his friendly criticism (*C.R.* xxi. pp. 49-51) of my review of his book (*ib.* pp. 19-23). I will take his points in the order in which he gives them.

The first is scarcely a serious one, and I would not allude to it if it had not worried Mr. Lang so much that he has even carried it to the unsympathetic columns of the *Illustrated London News*! I really do not see why Mr. Lang should have minded my making that remark about the Laird of Runraurie. I am lost in admiration at Mr. Lang's wide range of illustration, but the obvious relish with which he gives us details of the life and manners of Glenbucket and Glenbuckie and Arnprior of Leny and Cluny and Lochiel and Claverhouse and Dugald Dalgetty and the Sconce of Drums Nab and the Laird of Drumthwacket and Jamie Telfer of the Fair Dodhead, makes it fair to chaff him a little. It is quite a large gallery, you see, and we can add to it Sutherlandshire cairns, and Celtic hillocks near Kildonan, and Runrig fields, and Burns and his Sculduddery Lays, and Scott and Mrs. Brown and the Border Minstrelsy. The allusions to things Scottish are nearer twenty than two, and even those that are strictly Highland are more than Mr. Lang makes out. Why he should disown them I cannot conceive.

It is difficult to be more serious about the next point. Mr. Lang objects to my calling him an athetizer. If he regards it as a term of abuse, I gladly withdraw it. But what is to be my amended description of his views? he did not athetize the line about iron, he tells us, but 'offered alternative solutions,

twice.' What are these alternative solutions? *That either the line is a late addition, or his theory is untenable.* It is difficult to see how this improves matters! Does Mr. Lang, in point of fact, believe that the odds are even on his theory? I thought it was the one and only solution, complete and four-square, rising superior to any 'baffling residuum'! Is it my fault that I assumed that Mr. Lang believed in it?

I still maintain that the phrase in the *Odyssey* that 'iron does of itself attract a man' is the rock on which Mr. Lang's theory breaks, and that the evolutionary view is the only one on which it can be satisfactorily accounted for.

The next point we come to is the Shield of Achilles. I quite agree with Mr. Lang that in the great days of Knossos and Phaestos shields were probably not metal-plated. I have gone into the matter in my *Discoveries in Crete* (pp. 206-7), and it is sufficient to say here that it is not necessary to suppose that the work of art which inspired the first poet was a shield at all. It may have been a chest of cypress wood, such as that which was decorated with the porcelain plaques at Knossos. Such a description could be taken over as soon as ever shields were strengthened with bronze plates. The five folds of *Iliad*, xviii. 481, show us that the decoration was originally conceived as engraved on metal bands running round a foundation of hide. On the other hand, the making of the shield as we have it (468-80) points to a still later stage, contemporary with the tin greaves; it undoubtedly implies that the whole shield was of metal.

In regard to Shakespeare and North, I

never suggested that the analogy was an exact one. *Julius Caesar*, however, and *Coriolanus* are more to the point than *Troilus and Cressida*. In the former case Shakespeare clearly meant to give a picture of an historical situation, so far as he understood it. In the latter he felt himself almost as free as in his fairy tales; one might as well discuss whether the poets who gave us the *Odyssey* were anachronistic in their picture of the Cyclops. So far as analogy is of use at all, Shakespeare's Roman plays and the Book of Common Prayer are quite to the point. It was Mr. Lang, however, and not I, who appealed to analogy first. The real answer to this appeal is twofold. In the first place our data for testing Homeric anachronisms are still very slight; many of them may still escape our observation, for the simple reason that we do not know all that was worn, still less all that was thought, in the various centuries in question. That is partly why I mentioned the Book of Common Prayer. Does Mr. Lang believe that, apart from our knowledge of the history of the period, we could make out a convincing case that our Prayer Book, as we have it, shows in its phrasing stages of growth and conflicts between schools of thought? Would not Mr. Lang be using just the same language there as he does here, unless he happened to know the facts? Does the schoolboy, or the poet, or anyone else except those critics whom Mr. Lang distrusts, find a want of unity in the Psalms of David?

The other half of our answer is that the analogy from second-rate epics can never be valuable unless it be frankly recognised how second-rate they are. Mr. Lang's method is to point to the epics of other countries in whose composition evolution seems to have played a part, and to point out triumphantly that they are inferior to Homer. 'That is all that evolution can do!' is in effect what he says. The fact, however, that Homer is unique is really not our fault. It would be just as sensible to say that great dramas could not have been written in Latin, because Rome in fact produced none. The inability

of early Germany, or early France, or early India to produce a great epic is not to be put down to their sinful tendency to work by way of evolution. Unity can no more bring forward an analogy than evolution can. There is nothing in the world like the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. The *Aeneid* and *Paradise Lost* are just as far removed from them on the one side as the *Nibelungenlied* and the *Chanson de Roland* are on the other. It is here that Shakespeare's Roman plays come in to help us; they are at least an example of first-class work produced by evolution. If Mr. Lang wishes to be saved from his friends, and to realise by the way the value of a poet's opinion on such a matter, let him study the severe and delightful words Sir Alfred Austin addresses to critics who suggest that Shakespeare used North in the particular way that he actually did. I do not apologise for quoting them at length. Indeed, in Mr. T. W. Allen's words, 'The sixth form masters of our larger public schools would do well to commit them to memory, and instead of teaching bad prose, dictate them in lengths to their charges' (*C.R.* xxi. p. 16).

'Though Shakespeare,' said our Poet Laureate,¹ 'may have taken his plots and the names of his personages from wherever he happened to find them, he could by no possibility have borrowed prose passages from anyone and made poetry of them by turning them into verse. Poetry is not made in that fashion. The white heat, the fine frenzy of the brain in the moment of such composition, precludes so cold a procedure. To suppose that the poet deliberately takes his material, his subject-matter from others, and then transforms it into poetry by the aid of what Prospero calls his "so potent art" is to commit the mistake so often made by critics with an insufficient amount of imagination.'

RONALD M. BURROWS.

University College, Cardiff.

¹ *Times*, Sept. 23, 1904, quoted by R. H. Carr, *Plutarch's Lives of Coriolanus*, etc. Clar. Press, Introduction, p. xviii.

REVIEWS

HAUVETTE'S *ARCHILOQUE*.

Archiloque, Sa Vie et ses Poésies. Par AMÉDÉE HAUVETTE, Professeur adjoint à la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Paris. Paris: Albert Fontemoing, 1905. 8vo. Pp. x+302. Fr. 7.50.

M. HAUVETTE is already well known as the author of an interesting and exhaustive work on *Hérodote, Historien des Guerres Médiques* (1894) besides several other works dealing with the constitutional history of Athens (*Les Stratèges Athéniens* 1885, *De Archonte Rege* 1885), and a *Rapport sur une mission scientifique en Grèce*, 1892. His last work is a fascinating study of the great Ionic poet whom the ancients regarded as second to Homer alone (*cf. Velleius* 1. 5, *Anth. Pal.* xi. 20). The author regards Archilochus not only as the inventor of the iambic metre, the creator of a new poetic *genre*, and the precursor of the Old Comedy, but also as one of the first representatives of the Ionic spirit and art that played such an important rôle in the formation of the Greek genius. In a few striking phrases of the Preface an illuminating parallel is drawn between Ionic literature and Ionic art.

The most important section in the book is that devoted to the new documentary evidence furnished by an inscription published a few years ago by Hiller von Gärtringen.¹ If there is any validity in Hauvette's arguments, then he has discovered what we may call a solid foundation of Parian marble to replace the shifting sands of Alexandrian guesses. He claims to have refuted a view regarded as self-evident by many modern critics, viz. that the ancients had no traditional data for a life of Archilochus. Owing to the importance of the issues involved it would be well to examine his theory with some detail. From the words of

the inscription H. infers that it dealt exclusively with the life and writings of the Parian poet. (1) The name of Archilochus occurs in the first line of the fragment, and again in the fifth. (2) He is referred to as the poet *par excellence*, ὁ ποιητής. (3) The style and tone suggest a memorial monument rather than a chronicle of general or local history. H. v. Gärtringen and Hauvette at first believed that it originally formed part of a heroön or sanctuary dedicated to Archilochus. This Hauvette identified with a building mentioned by the orator Alcidas (fourth century B.C.): it was probably rebuilt in the first century B.C., when a tablet was added containing a record of the poet's life.

This suggests an unbroken local tradition of many centuries, and it would therefore seem that there existed materials for a life of Archilochus resting upon a far sounder basis than the ingenious combinations and learned synchronisms of scholars poring over manuscripts in the bookrooms of Alexandria. The statements of the inscription would thus receive official sanction investing it with an authority far superior to the irresponsible eulogies of an individual admirer.

Hardly had Hauvette corrected the final proofs of his book than he received from H. von Gärtringen a communication announcing the discovery of another fragment of the inscription, which had lain for many years in the archives of the Berlin Academy. This new portion, discussed in an appendix, abundantly proves that the whole inscription is devoted to Archilochus; but it completely divests it of the authority that attaches to an official document. We now know that it had no connexion with a heroön, but was engraved on the base of a statue 'erected, perhaps, in a gymnasium.'

The new fragment includes an epigram informing the reader that Sostheus, son of Prostheneas, won for himself undying fame by setting up a statue of Telesicles' son.

¹ *Mittheil. d. Archäol. instit. Athen.* Abtheil. xxv. 1900, pp. 1-22, and later as No. 445 *Inscr. Graec.* vol. xii. fasc. v., part 1, edited by H. v. G. and published by the Berlin Academy.

The inscriptions of Paros contain several references to a person of this name: he appears to have lived in the first century B.C.

It does not however follow that the biographical section of this *Monum. Arch.* was not originally included in a work of far wider scope than a mere life of Archilochus. Vv. 7-10 we read γέγραφεν δὲ ὁ Δημέας ἑκαστα [σαφή ποι]εῖν κ[α]ὶ γεγραμμένων ὑπὸ 'Αρχ[ι]-λόχον καὶ [ἄλλως (?) κατ' ἔτος (?) ἔ]καστον, καὶ ἤρκεται ἀπὸ ἀρχοντος πρώτον Εὐρ[-, ἐφ' οὗ δι]-αιρεῖ· πεντηκόντορος <ς> Μιλησίων κ.τ.λ. [I quote from the revision by H. v. G. in the *Inscr. Gr.*]

Although Demeas is mentioned in v. 1 there is no reason to suppose that the words εὖσ(ε)βήσας καὶ τῆς περὶ τὴν πα[τρ]ίδα σπουδῆς(?) are a quotation from his work: so Hauvette's argument (3) quoted above applies only to the memorial inscription. He has failed to prove that a hitherto unknown historian, Demeas of Paros, wrote about the middle of the fourth cent. B.C. a monograph on Archilochus from which the literary historians of Greece derived their information regarding the Parian poet. His theory is supported by the following arguments.

(1) The reference to Demeas is immediately followed by the story of Koiranos and the Dolphin. This, he says, proves that the work of Demeas was not a Parian chronicle in the sense of a λόγος or κτίσις Παρίων; otherwise the author would not have placed at the head of his book an incident in which Paros is assumed to be already a fully-developed state with magistrates and other officials. But what right have we to imagine that Demeas did begin with the extract used by the compiler of the inscription?

(2) Dates are given by Parian archons. But this does not prove that the author confined himself to Parian affairs. English historians date foreign events by the reigns of English kings, and we still hear that the Jubilee of Queen Victoria was celebrated when So-and-so was mayor of our native town.

(3) Starting from the assumption that Demeas dealt exclusively with Parian history, H. argues for an early date, on the ground that essays in local chronology preceded

those of general or national scope. But it does not follow that the former were discontinued because the latter had come into vogue.

(4) The most important argument still remains. A detailed comparison of the Koiranos legend as related by Phylarchus (ap. Athen. p. 606), Plutarch (*de Solert. anim.* § 36 Didot, p. 1205), and Aelian (*de natur. anim.* § 8. 3) led H. v. Gärtringen to the conclusion that these three writers used a common source which was itself derived from Demeas. No proof is given besides the following. (a) Plutarch in his account of the incident quotes a line from the poem composed upon it by Archilochus (fr. 114). As it is not likely that several writers covered exactly the same ground as Demeas, it follows that Demeas himself supplied tradition with the essential traits of the legend. (b) The version given by Demeas is simple; the others contain elaborate additions including 'a first and third act' intended to display the gratitude of the Dolphins for past favours. H. v. G. holds that the story received this new dress at the time of its insertion in a collection of anecdotes illustrating the intelligence of the brute creation.

Assuming that these changes demand a considerable interval between Phylarchus (fl. 220 B.C.) and Demeas, Hauvette has no hesitation in assigning the latter to the age of the Athidographers (mid. fourth cent.). His sources go back to *ἔφοι Παρίων* compiled by the logographers of the late sixth or early fifth cent.; and so we arrive almost within a hundred years of Archilochus himself.

This tempting theory will not bear examination. I have carefully compared the three versions with the corresponding passage in the inscription and have failed to discover any trace of interdependence, and I still remain a sceptic after reading the original article by H. v. G. (*Mittheil. l. c.*). The legend appears to have been an independent growth, and all the evidence points against any close connection between it and the poem of Archilochus. There is no quotation from the poet, nor is there a single reference to him in the versions of Phylarchus, Aelian, and Plutarch. It was by an afterthought after reaching the end of his story that

Plutarch added, 'and it is to this that Archilochus is said to refer when he composed the line...' This proves that the legend, in its fuller form, was not associated with the name of Archilochus, and so it could not have been derived from an account of that poet's life by Demeas or anyone else. Nor did Plutarch derive the reference to Archilochus from Demeas, as the line which he quotes is not found in the inscription. This disposes of the early date claimed for Demeas. Hauvette recognizes the futility of any attempt to connect him with the compilation of the Attic 'Parian Chronicle.' We have no means of giving him even an approximate date; we can only say that his writings included a chronological account of Archilochus composed for local use and utilized by the compiler of a Parian inscription in the first century B.C.

Chapter i. 2 is devoted to the criticism of commonly accepted chronological data.

§ 1 opens with an attack upon what is usually taken as a fixed starting-point by the biographers of Archilochus (e.g. Beloch and Crusius). Arch. fr. 74 refers to a total eclipse of the sun at midday. Between the eclipse of 763 and that of 585 the only eclipse visible within the basin of the Aegean was that of 648 at Thasos. Therefore, it has been argued, the poet must have been at Thasos in 648. 'Voilà dit-on, un fait acquis à la science!' But, as H. points out, in the light of the remarks with which Arist. (*Rhet.* iii. 17) introduces the lines in question, there is no need to suppose that Archilochus saw the eclipse himself, or even that it occurred within his lifetime. He might be referring to an ancient tradition or to the eclipse seen E. of Rhodes in 657.

In § 2 H. with good reason follows most modern edd. of Herodotus in rejecting as interpolated a statement in Hdt. i. 12, which makes Archilochus a contemporary of Gyges. All we know is that the poet composed fr. 25 after the accession of the Lydian king.

§ 3 deals with the oft-quoted line *κλαίω τὰ Θασίων, οὐ τὰ Μαγνήτων κακὰ* (fr. 20). H. is not quite right in saying that Strabo (14. 647) refers this to the overthrow of Magnesia on the Maeander by the Cimmerian Treri; for the incident is mentioned in close connection

with the subsequent seizure of the town by the Milesians (MSS.: edd. *Ephesians*), and both events are clearly included in the 'disaster' alluded to a few lines later.

As H. shows, Aristotle, the earliest historian who refers to 'the woes of M.' makes no mention of the Cimmerians in this connection; *Μάγνητες δὲ ὑπερβολὴν ἀτυχημάτων πολλὰ ἐκακώθησαν καὶ πον καὶ Ἀρχιλόχος φησι, κλαίω κ.τ.λ.* (Ar. ap. Heracl.). Schneidewin explains *ἀτυχ.* as a euphemism for *ἀσεβήματα*, and this fits in with the interpretation of the proverb given by Suidas: *παρ' ὅσον οὔτοι ἀσεβήσαντες εἰς θεὸν πολλῶν κακῶν ἐπειράθησαν.*

Hauvette believes that the kings of Lydia also sent in their contribution to swell 'the woes of M.' We know that Gyges attacked Smyrna, Colophon, and Miletus; and his alliance with a powerful Ephesian family would naturally lead him to attack their hated rival on the Maeander. This view is confirmed by a couplet in Theognis, both of whose references to the sufferings of Magnesia Hauvette, strangely enough, has entirely ignored, although the Megarian poet lived within less than a century of Archilochus: cf. Th. 1103-4 *ὕβρις καὶ Μάγνητας ἀπώλεσε καὶ Κολοφῶνα | καὶ Σμύρνην.* (Cf. also Th. 603.) He rightly refuses to adopt Arch. fr. 20 as the basis of any precise chronological scheme. It is probable that the proverb applied to a series of 'disasters;' but it would give us little help even if it could be attached to one definite date; it would be as futile to argue that the fall of Magnesia was a matter of recent history when Archilochus composed the poem in question, as it is to deny the claim of Theognis to the lines just mentioned on the ground that they must refer to the recent ruin of Smyrna.

Hauvette places the floruit of Archilochus in 665 B.C. and assigns 688 as the beginning of the Thasian period when the poet was engaged in the wars. In 665 we find him at Paros; the poems of this epoch are full of bitter attacks on individual enemies of the writer; there is no trace of political animosity. The date of his death is unknown; there is no need to place it after that of Gyges in 652, or the destruction of Magnesia (651). Archilochus preceded Callinus.

The remaining chapters of the book are full of interest. Ch. ii. deals with the history of the Text; ch. iii. is entitled 'Idées et mœurs dans la Poésie d'Archiloque'; ch. iv. is devoted to a thorough discussion of dialect, vocabulary, and metre, followed by sections on composition, style, and the general position of Archilochus in the history and litera-

ture of Ionian Greece. M. Hauvette has made a notable contribution to the elucidation of a great poet, who has hitherto been treated with undeserved neglect.

T. HUDSON WILLIAMS.

Univ. Coll.
Bangor.

BRUNN'S KLEINE SCHRIFTEN.

Heinrich Brunn's Kleine Schriften. Gesam-melt von HERMANN BRUNN und HEINRICH BULLE. Erster Band: Römische Denkmäler; Altitalische und Etruskische Denkmäler. 1898. Zweiter Band: Zur Griechischen Kunstgeschichte. 1905. Dritter Band: Interpretation; Allgemeines. Nachtrag. 1906. Leipzig and Berlin: G. B. Teubner. M. 44.

IN the preface to his recent *Altgriechische Plastik*, Dr. Lehmann well says that 'up to the time of Brunn the last word in archaeology rested with the antiquary and not with the art connoisseur, while the literary tradition of the ancients gave the cue for the description and appreciation of the monuments. Archaeology was looked upon merely as a help to antiquarian research. From this degraded position H. Brunn, and after him Adolf Furtwängler and Julius Lange have raised it to the rank of a self-supporting science based upon itself.' What Percy Gardner and S. Reinach said of Newton in their obituary notices, that it was he who in England substituted archaeological science for dilettantism, is equally true of Brunn in Germany.

Brunn's scientific method was illuminated by rare powers of divination amounting to creative genius. Nowhere is this more evident than in his noble work on the Greek artists, where he evokes from the dry bones of tradition the individual spirit and the personal aims and tendencies that animated each artist. The same intellectual power vivifies all his writings, and invests them with an interest which proves abiding even

in cases where their archaeological content has been superseded. For this reason we cannot but be grateful to Brunn's son Hermann and to Dr. Heinrich Bulle, one of the younger archaeologists of the Munich school, for collecting together and editing with minute care all the scattered minor writings of the great master, though we may also be allowed to regret that a grouping according to subjects has been adopted instead of a chronological order of production which would have revealed the growth of Brunn's ideas, his ever-increasing intellectual grasp, and the gradual enlarging of his horizon till it enclosed the whole domain of classical archaeology. At this date, when the actual theories must, as the editors themselves admit, be looked upon in measure as outworn, there seemed every reason to present them not in primary relation to the subjects discussed, but as they would most faithfully mirror the writer's intellectual life. True, the chronological list of Brunn's writings printed at the end of the third volume, goes a good way towards remedying what seems the defect of the book, while the nature of the material dictates to a certain extent a chronological arrangement.

Brunn started, as did every one in his day, by a study of Rome and Etruria, so that the essays contained in the first volume represent, on the whole, his earlier activity. In the second and third volumes Brunn's attention, like that of his contemporaries, becomes concentrated on the recently-revealed art of Greece. Unlike the majority of his contemporaries, however, he never, in contemplating the achievement of Greece,

lost sight of the whole history of his subject, nor indulged in that exclusive and one-sided admiration from the effects of which the study of Hellenic art itself has been the first to suffer.

The notes contributed by the editors are of discreet length and to the point, and many fresh illustrations have been introduced. Readers already familiar with them will recognize with delight celebrated and epoch-making papers like those on the frieze of the Mausoleum, on the Parthenon marbles, on the Pergamene finds, and such masterpieces of critical method as the paper on the 'Munich athlete.' The study of vases owes as much to Brunn almost as that of sculpture, and this is evident from the third volume, where we find collected together many familiar essays, chiefly concerned with the interpretation of vase pictures.

Among the articles on various topics in Vol. III are a number of obituary notices of various eminent scholars that display Brunn's striking literary gifts and his intellectual sympathy for the work and effort of others. Last, but not least, the volume closes with a set of three articles on Raphael, thus leaving a brilliant impression of the

vast range of the writer's powers and interests.

The First Preface, contributed by Dr. Hermann Brunn, contains a charming record of Brunn's character, of his powers of concentrated work, of his joyous personality, and his delight in the varied phenomena of life and of nature; of the naïve wonder of friends and colleagues when the great scholar chose to spend long spells of time apparently unoccupied in simply looking out of the window. This leisure, this mental spaciousness, is one which the scholar needs almost as much as the creative artist, though it must have surprised the Germans of fifty years ago. We are told, also, that his lucid vigorous language was the result of a search on his part to build for each thought, so to speak, 'the precise house' that fitted it. 'It seems to me of the highest importance,' wrote Brunn himself, 'not only to contribute a given result to science, but to embody it in such a form that even should the result prove incorrect, yet a complexion of permanent value would be set upon the question.' The Second Preface, by Dr. Heinrich Bulle, is an interesting analysis of Brunn's scientific aims and methods. EUGÉNIE STRONG.

ANCIENT SCULPTURE AND PAINTING.

(a) *Brunn-Bruckmann's Denkmäler Griechischer und Römischer Sculptur, fortgeführt und mit erläuternden Texten versehen* von PAUL ARNDT. Plates 501-600. Munich: F. Bruckmann, 1902-1906.

(b) *Denkmäler der Malerei des Altertums*, herausgegeben von PAUL HERRMANN. Munich: F. Bruckmann, 1907. Each part M. 20.

(a) NOTHING illustrates more vividly the activity of the Munich School of Archaeology founded by Brunn than the continuation by Dr. Paul Arndt of Brunn's huge repertorium of antique sculpture. Dr. Arndt took up the editing at No. 501, and a few months ago brought his two first parts, each numbering 50 Plates, to a close. The publication, owing to its size, and also to its cost, is not so well known in England as it should be. Indeed,

it is only recently that the British Museum has acquired a copy of this work. I propose to indicate briefly a few of the more remarkable items among these 100 Plates, each of which is accompanied by a short descriptive text either by Dr. Arndt himself or by distinguished collaborators, among whom appear the names of Furtwängler, Hauser, Amelung, and Sieveking.

A large proportion of the plates are of works now made known for the first time, or of works inadequately published and perhaps buried in inaccessible periodicals. The beautiful archaic Nike (headless) of the Akropolis (Kastriotis, Cat. 690) can be here compared with the fragment of another rather more archaic Nike in the same Museum (Kastriotis, 694) and with the fine bronze in the British Museum (Bronzes 491)

from the Payne-Knight collection. It is satisfactory, by the way, to find Arndt vindicating the Greek origin of the British Museum bronze. Of the sixteen archaic works of art among these new 'Denkmäler' the first in importance is assuredly the bronze chariot of Monteleone now worthily published and brilliantly described by Professor Furtwängler. The bronze chariot, which once doubtless belonged to some Italic prince of the sixth century, is the great treasure of the Metropolitan Museum of New York. Furtwängler bestows no more than due praise when he calls it 'the largest and most perfectly preserved extant work in beaten metal of archaic Greek art' and reckons it among the finest and most exquisite specimens of its kind. The style is Ionic, but the actual chariot is brought by Furtwängler into file with the Italo-Ionic products, gold rings and vases, discussed in his work on gems (III. p. 86). The magnificent reliefs constitute a trilogy, including the arming of a warrior (centre), the warrior victorious over his enemy (left side) and his 'apotheosis,' in which he is seen borne upward by winged horses, that soar above the recumbent figure of Earth (Plates 586, 587).

Among the works of the fifth and fourth centuries from English collections alone, we may note specially a fine replica of the Munich Diomedes. This head, which I knew when it was acquired by Mr. C. Newton-Robinson, has passed, I believe, into the now famous collection at Lewes. The head of a Polykleitan athlete which has gone from the Nelson collection in Liverpool to America is given on Pl. 544. It had already been well published by Mr. Ernest Gardner in the *J.H.S.* The beautiful head, still touched with archaism, belonging to Mr. Humphry Ward appears on Pl. 581. The connexion I had established between this head and the Aphrodite of the Ludovisi throne is admitted by Arndt. Plate 582 reproduces the grand fragment of a fifth-century *stèle* in Lansdowne House, which figured in the Greek Exhibition at the Burlington Fine Arts Club in 1903 (Cat. No. 4 and Plate V). Then we find on Plates 569, 570 the large statuette of Herakles

(also at Lewes House, and likewise exhibited at the B. F. A. C., Cat. No. 12), with an interesting description by Arndt, who follows out the fortunes of this type right through Imperial times down to Diocletian and Maximian, and takes occasion, I notice with pleasure, to vindicate the genuinely archaic character of the Albano basis in the Capitol (Helbig 428) with the replica of one of its scenes in the British Museum (Cat. 2207, where the relation to the Albano basis is overlooked). The labours of Herakles are figured on the basis, which is itself only a copy, but a genuine one, and not a mere 'archaistic fake.' The Lewes statuette is a copy of a Myronian work, slightly later in date than the grand head of Herakles also in the British Museum, and also now reproduced (568).

On Pl. 557 is reproduced the fine replica of the head of the Munich 'Oil-pourer,' which passed from Greece, over England, to the Museum of Boston. The great Apollo from Cyrene in the British Museum, one of the finest antique copies after a great Greek original, is done justice to by Amelung in his descriptive text to the reproduction of the Aphrodite Gaetani (Plate 593). Both works belong to the same circle which further includes the 'Hypnos' of the British Museum and of Madrid, and the exquisite and too little known Dionysos (or Apollo) of Tralles (*Rev. Archéol.* 1888, Pl. 14). The Gaetani head, according to Amelung, is from a statuary type of which we have an inferior but complete replica in the 'Aphrodite of Capua.'

The statue of a young 'Priestess'—or as here interpreted a 'Poetess'—in the Villa Sarsina at Porto d'Anzio, lately acquired by the Italian government, and now placed in the Museo Nazionale delle Terme, is worthily reproduced on Plates 583, 584, and excellently discussed by Amelung, who is absolutely right in completely discarding, as Altmann in *Oesterr. Jahreshefte* (vi. 1903) had done before him, the Praxitelean theories advanced by Klein in respect of this head. He brings it down to Hellenistic times, which is a step in the right direction, but if he has so much difficulty in discovering works really akin to it, this may be because the statue belongs to a later date

still. I own, however, that while Dr. Altmann felt reminded by the Anzio statue of the 'Dionysos of Tralles,' I for my part seemed to detect a likeness to the Apollo from Cyrene. A valuable addition to our growing knowledge of Myron is made by the publication of the genuine cast of the Discobolus Lancellotti, so happily detected by Furtwängler in the Collection of Casts at the Louvre (567). No. 598 reproduces what must henceforth rank as one of the most beautiful of antique reliefs, even though it be only an excellent copy executed presumably as late as the period of Hadrian. It comprises the two charming reliefs with dancing Horai and dancing Agrauides which evidently once adorned the same monument. These reliefs were acutely put together by Dr. Hauser out of fragments dispersed in the Galleria Chiaramonti, in the Uffizi, and in Munich. His present fine aesthetic appreciation should be read along with the more technical description that accompanied his proposed restoration when he first published it in the Austrian *Jahreshefte* vi (1903).¹ He takes occasion to compare these newly reconstituted reliefs, which had been so maltreated in the Renaissance, with the kindred and better known—though vastly inferior—relief of the Borghese dancers in the Louvre which has lately attracted considerable attention because of the bronze imitation by a seventeenth or eighteenth-century hand² lately found in the Hertford House collection.

The publication is equally rich in works

¹ Nor should it be forgotten that in the earlier article Dr. Hauser made a tempting though, as he admits, by no means proven suggestion to the effect that the originals of the reliefs of similar style in Tegel with the three Moirai, and with a Zeus and Hephaistos (from a 'Nativity of Athena') may have belonged to the same monument which he further surmises to have been the basis of the Altar of Zeus Soter, at the Peiraieus, noted both by Pliny and by Pausanias.

² The early date, proposed by Mr. Claude Phillips (*Burlington Magazine*, 1904, pp. 111-124) for this bronze must be abandoned, in the light of the arguments adduced by Dr. Bode (*Burlington Magazine*, 1904 (March), p. 215) and by M. Étienne Michon in *Monuments Piot* xii., 1905, pp. 159-176. M. Michon, however, favours the Louis XIV. period rather than that of Louis XVI. proposed by Dr. Bode.

of Roman sculpture—the beautiful relief of the Aktian Apollo (Pl. 595; text by Sieveking) of which I give a much reduced reproduction in my *Roman Sculpture* (Pl. VII) is an important addition to our knowledge of earlier Augustan art. The basis of Puteoli, not so contemptible a work of art as hitherto represented, is given on Pl. 575 with commentary by Sieveking. Finally a number of sculptures from the Arch of Constantine are admirably reproduced; these include the eight medallions claimed by Mr. Stuart Jones as Flavian in the *Papers of the British School at Rome* (vol. iii). I have elsewhere (*Roman Sculpture*, pp. 131-141) analysed this paper and shewn how Arndt's remarks as to the probable vicissitudes of these medallions in the Third Century A.D. formed the starting-point for Mr. Stuart Jones' brilliant researches. It is a pity that Arndt limits himself to reproducing the two slabs of the central archway and that neither Bruckmann nor any professional photographer has yet attempted to photograph the panels of the East and West attics. One remark of capital importance Arndt makes concerning the slabs of the archway: it is that the head of the Emperor has in both cases been worked up into a likeness of Constantine.

(b) The same firm that publishes the *Denkmäler* has started, under the able editorship of Dr. Paul Herrmann of Dresden, a publication of antique paintings (including mosaics) which promises to rank for importance and interest with their great sculpture serial. The first sixteen specimens are all Pompeian pictures, but it is promised that the scanty fragments of real Greek painting and the Cretan painting of Phaistos and Knossos will be fully represented. The two first folios do not belie the program unfolded in the carefully written *prospectus*. They include such masterpieces of the ancient *pictura* as the 'Medea' from Herculaneum (Pl. 7), the pastoral landscape 'Paris on Ida' (Pl. 8), the superb mosaic of the 'Lion and Panther' from Pompei (Pl. 9), and the 'Punishment of Eros,' which can now be studied with its companion picture 'Ares and Aphrodite' from the same house, and presumably by the same hand (Pls. 1, 2).

Hitherto Pompeian pictures have been studied mainly according to the classification by subjects in Helbig's *Campanische Malerei*. It is an immense step in advance to be able to study them grouped as much as possible according to the houses to which they belonged, for this grouping often represents the work of one artist or of one school. Thus Plates 10-16 reproduce seven magnificent paintings from that most in-

teresting of all Pompeian houses, the *Casa del Poeta Tragico*. The style of the reproductions and the critical text that accompanies them are equally beyond praise. But so valuable a publication ought to circulate widely outside Germany; we cannot, therefore, help regretting that the text is not issued in French or English as well as in German.

E. S.

ARCHITECTURE.

Die bildende Kunst der Gegenwart. By JOSEF STRZYGOWSKI. Quelle und Meyer: Leipzig, 1907. 300 pp. und 68 illustrations. M. 4.80.

THIS unpretentious little volume carries as sub-title 'ein Büchlein für Jedermann,' and may thus presumably be brought to the notice of readers of the 'Classical Review' also. It shows that in the hands of an exponent like Strzygowski the comparative method of criticism, based on a study of the art of the civilized world, issues not in dry-as-dust 'Grecian rules' but in living suggestions that can help artists and architects to discover forms suited to the needs of their time. The section 'Baukunst,' with its subdivisions, 'Monumentaler Raumbau,' 'Denkmalbau,' 'Privatbau,' seems calculated to satisfy those who ask what useful purpose in the present can be served by a study of the antique.

Classical archaeologists will find the book interspersed with admirable little pieces of criticism of antique works—e.g., of the Theseus of the Parthenon and of the composition apparently so simple, yet in reality so difficult, of the two figurer on the stele of Hegeso. In comparisons like that established between the 'Penseur' of Rodin or the 'Drama' of Klinger and the sitting figures of the 'Ludovisi Throne,' and in the excellent passages on the divergent functions of the antique and of modern art (see especially pp. 246-248), Strzygowski, without praising the one art at the expense of the

other, seizes and reveals the inner essence of each. The book teems with profound passages which show that the author has grasped not only problems of form, but also the problems of thought which govern any art worthy of the name. Indeed, the secret of Strzygowski's greatness as a critic is in his insistence upon the necessity for *Inhalt*, for substance and content in art. Two of the noblest sections in the present book are those respectively entitled 'Missachtung des Gegenstandes' and 'Malerei für Feinschmecker,' in which he denounces certain tendencies of modern art with the fearlessness of a prophet.

The examples of modern art are of necessity drawn in great measure from Germany, and Strzygowski shows himself no timid critic of the contemporary art of his adopted country, though he is full of healthy optimism for the future and of admiration of much that is done in the present, not only on the Continent, but also in England and in America. I think, however, that few outside Germany will follow him the whole length of his admiration for Böcklin, 'under whose flag' he admits the book to have been written. On the other hand many will sympathize with the fearless attack on the Imperial tastes that govern, or tried to govern, the arts in Prussia. Those interested in the teaching of art in schools and universities will find stimulating pages in the *Intermezzo* on 'Künstlerische Erziehung.' It should be noted that the little book, qualified by its author as an occasional writing, is

the outcome of a series of lectures on 'the method of looking at art' delivered by Strzygowski in 1905, at Innsbruck, as part of a summer course to teachers. The subject is one that sorely needs introducing into England.

We cannot too earnestly insist on Strzygowski's warning (pp. 141, 142), that if children and young students are to profit by all the modern paraphernalia of cheap reproductions and illustrated school-books, there must be trained teachers to guide them. 'In all our efforts we think only of the pupils. I am strongly of opinion, however, that it is high time to recollect that teachers, if they are to impart information, should

first have had the advantage of similar instruction themselves.'—At a time, moreover, when our own great national collection of antiques is being re-labelled, as if the function of each object were to illustrate Leprieux's mythology, it would be well to ponder Strzygowski's advice as to the way to use museums.

In closing the book we recall with admiration that these living pages emanate from a scholar foremost in the ranks both of Oriental and of Classical archaeologists, though he won his earliest laurels as a *Kunsthistoriker*, in the narrower sense, with studies on the Italian Renaissance, ranging from Cimabue to the 'Baroque.' E. S.

FRIEDLAENDER'S *PETRONIUS*: ED. 2.

Petronii Cena Trimalchionis, mit deutscher Übersetzung und erklärenden Anmerkungen.

Von L. FRIEDLAENDER. 2. Aufl. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1906. 8vo. Pp. 362. M. 6, bound M. 7.

THE second edition of Friedlaender's *Cena Trimalchionis* follows quickly upon the fourth of Bücheler's *Petronius*. The author has kept a vigilant eye upon all that has appeared bearing on Petronius in the fifteen years that have elapsed since the issue of the first edition. Collignon's books, Heräus' articles, Götz's *Corpus Glossariorum latinorum*, and communications from C. F. W. Müller are largely responsible for the changes that the book has now undergone.

The plan, indeed, remains unaltered—introductions, dealing with literary questions and city life in Italy; text and critical notes, with translation on the opposite page; explanatory notes. But the introductions have been remodelled, the text improved, and some twenty-five pages added to the explanatory notes. Hardly a page, indeed, in this part of the book but bears the trace of the revising hand.

In the literary introduction the question of Petronius' relations to the Greek novelists, curiously ignored in the first edition but

brought into prominence by Burger's and Heinze's articles in *Hermes*, now receives treatment. F. thinks it unnecessary to assume the existence of Greek models and scouts Heinze's theory that the satirae were a parody of a serious Greek Romance. He might have referred to Schmid's interesting remarks, *Neue Jahrbücher*, 1904, p. 475. On another vexed question, that as to the scene in which the drama of the Banquet is laid, F. has changed his position. Formerly he accepted Mommsen's view that it was Cumae. There was not much evidence in favour of that view, and against it was one very definite fact. At the banquet Trimalchio happens to remark that he had seen the Sibyl at Cumae. Anyone who feels sure that a Canterbury resident, giving a dinner in that city, would not use the phrase 'the Cathedral at Canterbury' must do one of two things in dealing with the passage of Petronius. In 1891 the bracketing of the obnoxious *Cumis* was the obvious resource: in 1906 we assume that Trimalchio's banquet was not given in Cumae. And Dr. Friedlaender accepts the very plausible suggestion that Puteoli was the town in question. I must say the episode of the Egyptian skeleton in ch. 34 has always prejudiced me in favour of the city which the Alexandrian cornships frequented. The

influence of foreign sailors on seaports is no doubt considerable: I know one little Devonshire port where the lower classes use an opprobrious phrase of unmistakeably French origin. An account of Puteoli itself forms the subject of a new section, about three pages in length. The chapter on city life remains unaltered.

The following list of noteworthy changes in the text may be found useful. Chap. 27 *circulis ludentium* (Heins.), 35 *oclopectam* (Büch.⁴), 38 *subalapo* (Heräus), 46 *qui potes loquere, non loquis* (Büch.⁴), 47 *ne* (Her., Büch.⁴), 55 *quo margarita cara, tribacia Indica* (partly a return to the MSS., partly from Heräus), 58 *conieci* (Büch.⁴), *at nunc* (Her.), 59 *aeque cor non habebas* (Heins.), 60 *consurreximus et altius* (Ohlert), 62 *homo meus coepit ad stelas facere se, eo ego* etc. (Müller), 64 *ut suis se teneant, dum redimus* (Büch.⁴), *oppositaque* (Funck, with the Trau MS.), 73 *exsonabant* (Büch.⁴; *exonabant* the Trau MS.), *in solio* (Scheffer; *in solo* the Trau MS.), 77 *cenationem* (Scheffer). There are a few misprints in the apparatus: on p. 102 the note on l. 21 is out of place, on p. 128 l. 17 the reading of the MS. is not stated, on p. 132 l. 7 the name of *Tylebomenus* is printed in Roman type, so that he appears as part of an emendation of Bücheler's. On p. 202 most of what stands in the note to l. 8 really belongs to l. 10. The apparatus might be abridged with advantage: it is hardly necessary to record all the emendations which a scholar has at various times hazarded on a crucial passage. Not but what there is instruction to be derived from such a note as stands on p. 160: '*hic refecit* Büch.³⁴, . . . *liquefecit?* Büch.², . . . *minorem fecit?* Büch.³, . . . *hinc reiecit?* Büch.'

As for the translation, except so far as change of reading ruled otherwise, it has been left as it was. Some slight inaccuracies, which I had marked in my copy of ed. 1, have now been corrected. In ch. 58 *qui te natum non putat*, 62 *sedeo-numero*, 66 *et rapam et senape* were omitted, and are now duly rendered. There still remain two: ch. 32 *anulum grandem subauratum* 'einen kleinen etwas vergoldeten Ring,' and ch. 72, where the words *ait ille* are ignored, so that the whole passage *quid cogitas—exeamus* is as-

signed to Encolpius. The translation of *plane etiam hoc servus tuus indicare potest* ch. 41 runs as before: 'Auch dies kann dein gehorsamster Diener dir berichten.' The speaker is one of Encolpius' fellow-guests, and I have always supposed that he meant 'Why your slave Giton there could tell you that.' I admit that the position of *etiam* is against my rendering, but what becomes of *plane* with Friedlaender? To say nothing of the extraordinary meaning given by him to *servus tuus*, 'your humble servant,' a meaning which he bases on the analogy of the use of *dominus* in polite address, but which he admits he has found nowhere else.

That the notes have been thoroughly revised has been already mentioned. Colloquial Latin is still more fully treated than before—the glosses are of much use here—and proverbs and folklore, etc. freely illustrated, especially from the Neapolitan. Several notes are greatly improved by being rewritten. I may perhaps enable readers to get some idea of the changes introduced by pointing to the addenda to the notes on ch. 29 *parietem persequi*, 35 *laruam argenteam*, 37 *nummorum nummos*, 39 *in cancro natus*, 41 *matus*, 53 *baro*, 56 *canale*, 64 *bucca, bucca, &c.*; the corrections of old notes on 38 *sociorum olla male feruet* (but does 'Too many cooks spoil the broth' suit the context?), 46 *non es nostrae fasciae*, 77 *tu dominam tuam &c.*; and the new notes on 38 *illi*, 40 *sophos clamamus*, 43 *annos secum tulisse*, 47 *nenias*, 58 *liet mehercules*, and on most of the new readings mentioned above.

This brief description of the book will, I trust, make it clear to all admirers of Petronius that a place must be found for it in their libraries. In conclusion I cannot but express my regret that no fresh light is thrown on two notorious *crucis*. The note on *pica pulvinaris* is simply reprinted, with its plaintive 'Was eine "Ackerbeetelster" sein soll (Georges s. *pulvinaris*) weiss ich nicht.' If Dr. Friedlaender has not yet solved the mystery of a word evidently familiar to a contemporary and a fellow-countryman, we ought to congratulate ourselves that we can interpret so much as we can of Petronius. The other problem is *mulier quae mulier miluinum genus*. Dr. Friedlaender has added

a few words to his note on the passage, but they seem to refer rather to the corresponding Varro passage than Petronius. Is it not simplest to translate 'A woman that is a real woman is bound to have some of the kite about her,' 'woman thy name is selfishness'?

A woman that was not selfish would be a *monstrum*, not a *mulier*. Compare the well-known Petronian phrases *discordia, non homo; piper, non homo; codex, non mulier*.

WALTER C. SUMMERS.

Sheffield.

THEODORE OF STUDIUM.

Theodore of Studium: His Life and Times.

By ALICE GARDNER, Lecturer and Associate of Newnham College, Cambridge; Author of *Julian the Philosopher, Studies in John the Scot*, etc. London: Edward Arnold, 1905. 8vo. Pp. xii + 284. Eight illustrations, chiefly of Byzantine architecture of the sixth and seventh centuries; one facsimile of a page from Studite Psalter of the eleventh century. 10s. 6d. net.

THIS remarkable work, the production of a well-known lady-lecturer at Newnham College, has scarcely yet received the share of attention from classical scholars to which it is entitled. Doubtless this is due to the fact that the figure of Theodore Studites is chiefly interesting to students of Ecclesiastical history; and those who are not concerned with the story of the Byzantine Church in a somewhat dreary epoch of its existence may be disposed to rest content with such knowledge of Theodore's career as they can derive from the unsympathetic pages of Gibbon.

Of course the Iconoclastic controversy is and must always remain the staple of any life of Theodore. It was this which brought him into collision with Byzantine autocracy, which earned for him three banishments, seven scourgings and harsh imprisonments: this also which, when the cause in whose behalf he had suffered became triumphant, secured for him an honourable place in the Diptychs of the Eastern Church, which to this day on the First Sunday in Lent reads out his name at a solemn service, the people answering with threefold murmur of applause 'May his memory endure for ever.'

But, as Miss Gardner has well shown us in this admirable monograph, Theodore of Studium was not merely an ecclesiastical controversialist. He sprang from a family of high official rank: he was an efficient administrator of a convent as celebrated in the East as Cluny in the West, he was a poet, a copious letter-writer, and probably a sharer in that important palaeographic reform which by substituting the Minuscule for the Uncial script greatly facilitated the multiplication of manuscripts.¹

And moreover the time in which he lived, the last half of the eighth century and the first quarter of the ninth, was of such immense importance for the whole subsequent history of Europe that even at the cost of a few tedious discussions about the worship or the destruction of sacred images, it is well worth while to see—as we can in Miss Gardner's graphic pages—what that time looked like to one of the foremost actors on the stage.

Theodore was born in 759, when the strong, fleshly, Isaurian Emperor, Constantine Copronymus, had been eighteen years on the throne. He suffered his first exile, along with his uncle and spiritual father the Abbot Plato, when the grandson of Copronymus, Constantine VI, divorcing his wife and marrying his mistress, brought himself into collision with the more respectable and independent personages in the Church of

¹ The reader who may be interested in this side of Theodore's work and who may not have leisure to follow him throughout his ecclesiastical career is specially referred to Miss Gardner's most interesting chapter on 'Theodore's Place in Calligraphy and Hymnography' (pp. 230-244) and to the Appendix following it, which contains renderings into English of some of Theodore's poems.

Constantinople, of whom Theodore, now abbot of Studium, was one of the chief.

He owed his return from exile (in 797) to that hateful deed by which Irene, mother of Constantine VI, usurped the throne of her son, handing him over to the torturers to be blinded by them in that same purple chamber in which she had given him birth. With Irene came back the sacred *icons* as well as their advocate Theodore. Happily the restored exile has not disgraced himself by any word of express approval of this crime, though his biographer honestly confesses to her 'regret that she can find in his writings no word to condemn the iniquitous acts which brought about his restoration.'

One of the most important elements in these palace tragedies was their effect in determining the permanent relations of what were to be henceforward the Eastern and Western Empires. There can be little doubt that Irene's tragic usurpation of the Imperial seat of the Roman Caesars was one cause of the assumption by Charles the Great of the title of Augustus on Christmas day 800. Some years before that event, long but in the end fruitless negotiations had taken place between the Frankish and Byzantine courts, respecting the marriage of the ill-fated Constantine VI to Charles's daughter Hrothrud. After the same event a stranger web of negotiations was being woven for the marriage of the elderly Emperor and Empress, Charles and Irene; but this marvellous scheme was defeated by the dethronement of the Eastern Augusta.

Miss Gardner has some excellent remarks on the possible results to Europe, if Irene in the early days of her regency, before she had soiled her hands with crime, had honestly sought to unite her policy, civil and ecclesiastical, with that of the mighty king of the Franks and Lombards.

'If a Council could have been called oecumenic or universal in reality as in profession, and if this Council had sought not only to assert the same standard of faith and ritual for East and West, but also to adjust the rival claims of patriarchal powers, and particularly to establish a *modus vivendi* with the Papacy in Rome, and if at the same time the Imperial Court at Byzan-

tium had drawn nearer to the other great Court of Christendom, that of the Frankish champions of Papal power, then we may fairly say that the unity of Christendom would have been assured in ways passing the dreams of the most visionary Catholics and cosmopolitans; Charles the Great would never have been crowned in Rome; the Crusades would not have failed for want of unity and a policy in militant Christendom; Greece would have continued to dominate the barbarian world; and there would have been no Renaissance needed, for there would have been no death or trance of ancient culture. . . . It seems hardly too much to say, that if Theodore of Studium had been ten years older at this time, in which case he would doubtless have taken a leading part in what was done, the cause of unity, at least in the ecclesiastical sphere, might have triumphed . . . and if ecclesiastical unity had prevailed in East and West, imperial unity would have had a larger and more rigorous life; there would have been no Holy Roman Empire as a separate and Western institution, and the whole course of European progress would have taken a different direction.'

With the downfall of Irene and the accession of the Logothete, Nicephorus, came before long the second exile of Theodore, not however this time on the main question of image-worship, but because of his refusal to communicate with the Ecclesiastic who had solemnized the adulterous marriage of Constantine VI. He was not banished to a distance, only, it would seem, to the Island of Prinkipo in the Sea of Marmora, but his beloved monastery of Studium was broken up and its inmates scattered far and wide.

Then came the tragedy of the unsuccessful campaign of the Greek Emperor against the Bulgarians (how strangely modern these words sound, in connexion with recent events!), his death in battle, and the accession of one whom Miss Gardner well styles a *Pfaffen-kaiser*, Michael Rhangabe. This turn of the wheel brought brighter days for Studium and incidentally the fullest recognition that for many years any Eastern Emperor granted to the Imperial dignity of the Frankish sovereign. But Theodore's

restoration was not for long. The *Pfaffen-kaiser* in two or three years' time had to give away to a more successful soldier, Leo the Armenian; and he, like most of the soldier-emperors at this time, was an Iconoclast. In defiance of the Imperial decrees, Theodore caused the prohibited icons to be borne on Palm Sunday in solemn procession round his monastery and of course in due time received an order for banishment from the neighbourhood of Constantinople. This third exile, which lasted for six years, from 815 to 821, was the longest of all his captivities. He was scourged, as gently as the executioners dared to wield the lash, and was for part of the time kept in pretty close confinement at Smyrna, not so close however as to prevent his conducting a voluminous correspondence with his dispersed monks, with influential courtiers at Constantinople, and with Pope Paschal I., whom he adjured to stretch forth his hand to convene a council to relieve the orthodox church from the tyranny of the Iconoclasts.

It was not however from the Roman pontiff that Theodore's deliverance was to come, but from another of the often-recurring palace conspiracies, by which Leo the Armenian while lustily singing psalms in the Imperial chapel on a dark Christmas morning was struck down by a band of assassins, who drew his rival, the condemned Michael, out of his dungeon and placed him on the throne.

Thus for the last time was Theodore of Studium free, but he hardly regained his

old influence, nor lived to witness the eventual and complete triumph of his cherished icons. He died in 826 in the sixty-eighth year of his age and his body, at first buried in the Island of Prinkipo, was eighteen years later, at the end of the Iconoclastic controversy, transferred to his beloved Studium, and there laid side by side with that of his uncle and brother, who had fought on his side in the great controversy.

Of the merits of that controversy this is not the place to speak. We may confess that while condemning the fierce brutality of most of the Iconoclast Emperors we cannot follow the author in her defence of the theological soundness of Iconodulia. Neither to break nor to worship a statue of Jupiter Olympius or a majestic mosaic of Christ seems to be our fitting attitude in the twentieth century, and possibly it would have been the right attitude in the ninth century also. But be this as it may, there is no doubt that the man whose life is here unfolded before us was one of the noblest figures in Byzantine history—not too fruitful in noble characters—that he acted from sincere and earnest convictions and that in setting himself against that unholy mixture of temporal and spiritual power which has been of late known by the name of Cesaro-papism he deserved well of his country, and however we may differ from his special line of argument, was really serving the great cause of the freedom of human thought.

THOMAS HODGKIN.

A COLLECTION OF GREEK COINS.

Die griechischen Münzen der Sammlung Warren. By KURT REGLING. Berlin: G. Reimer, 1906. Text and Plates. M. 40.

THIS excellent Catalogue describes a collection of 1769 coins of the Greek series till lately in the possession of Mr. E. P. Warren of Lewes. Some collectors and numismatists whose memories carry them back some way will note as they glance at the plates a fine array of electrum pieces and other rare coins

which they will recognize as old friends. The Warren Collection, in fact, enshrines the well-known cabinet (1016 specimens) of the Rev. W. Greenwell, and I notice many coins which were long ago shown at the British Museum at critical moments just before, or just after, they had come into Mr. Greenwell's possession and which, I remember, were discussed from every conceivable point of view by the collector and the Museum officials. In or before 1902 Mr.

Greenwell decided to dispose of his fine collection. I believe no formal offer of it was ever made to the authorities of our national Museum, and English archaeologists will regret this. At the same time, Mr. Warren is to be congratulated on having saved this carefully formed 'assemblage' from dispersion by auction and thus enabling it to be finally acquired—together with many additions made by himself—by the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, where it will, no doubt, do much to foster a taste for ancient art and the scientific study of an important branch of archaeology.

Mr. Greenwell was especially interested in electrum coinage, chiefly the coinage of Cyzicus. He acquired, when such things were just beginning to come into the market, a number of fine specimens of the gold staters of Lampsacus, a series in many respects akin to the Cyzicenes. He had a predilection also for the coins of two or three important cities, notably Abdera and Cyrene, and—what is not exceptional—for Sicilian coins. Mr. Warren appears to have usefully extended the collection on the lines laid down by Mr. Greenwell, but has added coins of many other classes. The collection as a whole, except for the series which Mr. Greenwell specially collected, is not so interesting to students as a collection like that of the late Sir Edward Bunbury, or the collection of Sir Hermann Weber, whose zeal and catholic tastes time does not abate. Both these collections contain or contained a number of interesting pieces in bronze—a humble but instructive metal which Mr. Greenwell and Mr. Warren seem rather to have disdained, though one understands their point of view as collectors. Some sections of the Warren Collection are, therefore, disappointing to numismatists. There is a heading 'Cappadocia,' but the coinage described consists only of a couple of regal drachms. The Seleucid and Ptolemaic series are scanty. There is one coin of Sidon; there are two of Tyre.

In arranging for the publication of his catalogue, Mr. Warren has been so fortunate as to secure the services of a member of the Berlin coin-cabinet, Dr. Regling, whose learned numismatic researches are familiar

to archaeologists. The book is handsomely printed, and the quarto *format* recalls that of the Berlin "Corpus numorum." It is not quite so easy to hold as the smaller volumes of the Berlin and British Museum Catalogues, but numismatic books hardly belong to the handy 'fireside' literature beloved of Dr. Johnson. Certainly, it gives a larger and more serviceable page than the octavo size, and the plan of noting the Plate-references in the margin—first adopted, I think, in M. Svoronos's 'Crete'—is one deserving of imitation. Personally, also (after many laborious years spent in turning from text to plates placed somewhere at the end), I much approve of Dr. Regling's method of presenting the Plates—there is here a liberal supply of 37—apart from the text. They are far more convenient for reference in this way, and, being bound together, cannot go astray.

As might be expected, Dr. Regling has carried out his task in a most workmanlike way. His descriptions of types are careful and judicious, though I think that in the case of Rhegium he has too hastily deposed 'Demos,' and set up Aristaeos, whose claim is not supported by any decisive evidence. All through, sufficient references to the literature and chronology are added, and notice is even taken of the identities of dies, a branch of numismatic activity which easy-going collectors have now to reckon with. There are also many useful notes which are well worthy of the attention of numismatists. Among them may be mentioned those dealing with the chronology of the coins of Elis (p. 143); the dating of the earliest 'owl-coins' of Athens, which Dr. Regling assigns to the time of Pisistratus (*circa* B.C. 560); symbols punning on names (p. 75); coins on which animals are shown curiously branded, like the ox of Poseidonia which is stamped with a caduceus. For the *selinon* type of the well-known Sicilian city, we have not only a reference to Holm but to 'The Athenaeum, 1901, II. p. 61,' a reference which I have not yet conscientiously verified but which I think must refer to the late Mr. Samuel Butler's attempt to grow the Selinuntine plant in a London square.

WARWICK WROTH.

SHORT NOTICES

INCUBATION.

Incubation, or the Cure of Disease in Pagan Temples and Christian Churches. By MARY HAMILTON, M.A., Carnegie Research Scholar. Simpkin, Marshall and Co. Pp. vi + 228. 5s. net.

INCUBATION is so important in ancient religion and medicine, and it has left traces so remarkable in the modern world, that a monograph on the subject is welcome. I have myself called attention to this matter, and described the scenes observed in certain holy places of modern Greece (*Greek Votive Offerings*, 200 ff.): this notice seems to have escaped Miss Hamilton, but it is desirable to have as many independent observations as possible.

Her first part describes the practices in Epidauros, Rome and Lebene, at the oracles of Amphiaraos, Trophonios, and Dionysos, and in the cults of Isis and Serapis: she adds a useful analysis of the case of Aelius Aristides, whose morbid visions are full of light for the question. This section is done with a fair degree of success; but in such a monograph we expect a complete collection of the important inscriptions, the text at least, with or without translation, and a mustering of authorities. Here Miss Hamilton has been content with a small selection, and she has not exhausted the authorities. I do not think she is right in ascribing incubation to the Selloi mentioned by Homer (alluded to without reference on p. 7). Much of the section is scrappy, and there is a lack of thoroughness and exactness. Aristophanes' description of incubation, for example, is placed under Epidauros.

The second part, Incubation in Christian Churches during the Middle Ages, breaks almost new ground. She has searched the *Acta Sanctorum* and records of saintly miracles, and has collected a considerable amount of illustration of the ancient practice. In the third part Miss Hamilton deals with instances of incubation seen or recorded in Italy and Greece. The festival at Tinos is described in detail, and a summary account is given of a large number of other shrines in the Greek lands.

The book is a useful piece of work and deserves the study of those who would understand the life of the ancient world.

W. H. D. ROUSE.

Charakteristik der lateinischen Sprache. Von Gymnasial-Professor DR. F. OSKAR WEISE. Dritte Auflage. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1905. Small 8vo. Pp. vi + 190. M. 2.80.

THIS charming little book, which has now reached its third edition in German, and has also been translated into French and Modern Greek, contains a general review of the Latin language from the standpoint of content and style. The author treats this language, as in a companion volume he treats his mother tongue, as a thing of beauty and interest in itself, and also as an index to the same qualities in the people who created and used it. Many of his suggestions may seem fanciful or overdrawn, but all of them are at least worthy of consideration. In the archaic period he attributes to the Romans strong family affections and a taste for pork on the ground of the large vocabulary connected with these subjects: on similar grounds he considers that love was with them a matter of intelligence rather than of feeling. He traces a clownish temperament in the naming of individuals after personal defects, e.g. Strabo, Pactus. A strong sense of discipline is, he thinks, shown in the extended use of subordinate clauses. The boundless magnificence of the new empire finds a parallel in the length of Livy's periods: the degeneracy of the first century of the Christian epoch is marked by the fantastic style of the early silver age of literature. In these judgments it is probable that prejudice plays a part; but if we are too severe on this point we shall probably need to abandon aesthetic criticism altogether. The author does justice to the extremeness of the style of Cicero and Caesar, and the notes almost constitute a bibliography of works on the Latin language in general and on the style of the most important Latin authors.

EDWARD V. ARNOLD.

Der Enoplios. Ein Beitrag zur griechischen Metrik. Von DR. PHIL. E. HERKENRATH. Teubner, 1906. Pp. ix + 185. M. 6.

NOT the least among the many services rendered by Blass to classical scholarship was his demonstration of the true nature of what used to be absurdly called 'dactylo-epitritic' verse. It is a sign of the sanity of his judgment that he knew the limits of his knowledge; 'utinam aliquando dicere possimus de enopliis numeris: σφῶραν ἐξέβαλεν προκόπτας!' (*Praef. ad Bacchyl.* xxxv). Dr. Herkenrath alas has no such misgivings; he not only knows an enoplios when he sees it but he sees it everywhere. For instance the Telesilleion, — — — — —, is a form of enoplios, and the Alcaic hendecasyllable is composed of a diambus plus a Telesilleion. Therefore the Alcaic is an enoplian metre.

It is quite evident that Dr. Herkenrath knows this, but *how* does he know it? Perhaps he may say that something of the sort is to be found in Hephaestion xiv. But if we are to accept the authority of Hephaestion, there is an end of Dr. Herkenrath, for Hephaestion calls 'Ερασμονίδη Χαρίλαε (which Dr. Herkenrath, following Wilamowitz, knows to be an enoplios), a hephthemimeral anapaest. Again our two modern authorities call 'Ερασμονίδη Βάθυλλε another form of enoplios, but Hephaestion declares positively that Cratinus, when he parodied 'Ερασμονίδη Χαρίλαε by 'Ερασμονίδη Βάθυλλε, mistook the metre.

Such is the nature of the evidence, and it seems too sandy to bear much of a superstructure. The author's textual criticism does not inspire confidence either. For instance at Soph. Phil. 679, he positively reads 'Ἰλιονα κατ' ἄμπυκα δὴ δρομάδα, making it respond to παρ' ὧι στόνον ἀντιτύπω βαρύ-, in order that we may have yet another variety of the inexhaustible enoplios. I do not understand the condition of a mind which swallows such a metrical camel and yet has so little faith in the MSS. that it assails the natural and simple phrase στόνον ἀντίτυπον, a phrase which recurs again at 1460 of the very same play.

By proceeding in this arbitrary fashion one can do anything with Greek metres. One ancient school derived every variety of metre from the epic hexameter and the iambic trimeter; a little ingenuity will enable anybody who likes to derive everything from ithyphallics and anapaests. It is a pity to see such a quantity of labour wasted in such frivolities. One reads again Blass's half-dozen modest and masterly pages and sighs for a little of his caution and sobriety.

ARTHUR PLATT.

Procli Diadochi in Platonis Timaeum Commentaria.
Edidit ERNESTUS DIEHL. Vol. III. Leipzig:
B. G. Teubner, 1906. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xiv + 504.
M. 12.

HERR DIEHL is to be congratulated upon having completed his handy edition of Proclus 'in Timaeum.' The work is done with the care and thoroughness usual in editors of Teubner texts; and students of Neo-Platonism owe a debt of gratitude to both editor and publisher for having provided them with a text at once more convenient and more up-to-date than the Schneider edition of 1847. This, being the concluding volume, contains the Indexes to the whole work—viz. an 'Index Auctorum,' an 'Index Verborum,' and an 'Indiculus observationum grammaticarum'—together with a list of 'addenda et corrigenda' which, considering the extent of the work, is by no means unduly long. This third volume includes pp. 238 c-end, in which Proclus comments on *Timaeus* 37 c-44 d. The text depends mainly on two Paris codices, Q (14th cent.) and D (16th cent.); in addition to which there is the evidence of Michael Psellus' treatise *eis tēn ψυχογονίαν τοῦ Πλάτωνος* (11th cent.), the value of which is discussed in the 'praefatio.' Diehl holds that the new readings supplied by Psellus are overrated by Bidez, and possess little independent value. In textual details

Herr Diehl has had the advantage of consulting with the experienced editor of Proclus 'in rempublicam,' Herr G. Kroll, who has supplied many acute corrections and suggestions to be found in the footnotes. The ingenuity of these two scholars may be tested by a reference to that desperate passage 289 D ff., where the supplements suggested are sufficiently plausible.

The present edition will prove of interest to students of Plato, also, in so far as the citations in Proclus are evidence for the text of the *Timaeus*. For instance, in citing *Tim.* 39 c, Proclus writes μήν (not μέν as most Platonic codd.), and κύκλον ἐπικατάλβη τὸν ἥλιον (instead of κύκλον ἥλιον ἐπικ.); again in 41 A, Proclus has δέ for δὲ and puts θεοί after φαίνονται instead of after θέλονται; and similar variations might be multiplied. To have gained further assurance as to what Proclus really wrote in these cases is a distinct advantage to the student of the Platonic text; and for giving us such assurance we are grateful to Herr Diehl.

R. G. BURY.

Essays and Addresses. By Sir R. C. JEBB.
Pp. viii + 648. Cambridge University Press. 10s. 6d.

THIS book contains a number of scattered papers, all printed before, but many of them difficult of access. There is no need to examine in detail papers which have been long before the world: we need only mention the more important. The paper on Pindar, reprinted from an early number of the *J.H.S.*, is the only scholarly account of his genius which we know of; and this alone would make the book worth having. But besides this, several other papers touch on Greek scholarship, especially from the dramatic and human side: 'The Genius of Sophocles,' 'The Speeches of Thucydides,' 'Suidas and the Trilogy,' 'The Age of Pericles.' In the 'Ancient Organs of Public Opinion,' Sir Richard Jebb touches a new subject with a light hand; but his humour serves only to spice without disguising his intelligent insight. Other papers are of more general literary interest: as Erasmus, Humanism in Education, Samuel Johnson, and several dealing with the present position of Classical Studies. The paper on Delos, written in 1880, needs to be brought up to date.

There is no index.

Translations into Greek and Latin Verse. By Sir R. C. JEBB. Second Edition. Pp. xiv + 320.
Cambridge University Press. 7s. 6d. net.

SIR R. JEBB's skill in Greek verse is something quite uncanny; when 'from out the soul of Pindar in him, he rolls an Olympian,' he goes where perhaps hardly one living scholar can follow him. His Latin verse is beautiful, often enough, but in Greek he speaks his own language. These versions are nearly all well known and admired by all: they need no new praise. To this reprint several additions have been made: one is a Pindaric ode, a version of Leopardi's on the Monument to Dante; one an original ode in Pindaric metre; and there is an amusing experiment in literary 'Russian Scandal,' an English piece being translated first into Latin, thence into Greek, and then through German and French into English again. The result is instructive.

VERSION

I WISH in heaven his soul may dwell,
That first found out the Leather Bottel.

A Leather Bottel we know is good,
Far better than glasses or cans of wood.
For when a man is at work in the field,
Your glasses and pots no comfort will yield.
Then a good Leather Bottel standing him
by,

He may drink always when he is adry.
'Twill revive the spirits and comfort the
brain;

Wherefore let none this Bottel refrain.
For I wish in heaven his soul may dwell
That first found out the Leather Bottel.

Also the honest Scythe-man too,
He knew not very well what to do,
But for his Bottel him standing near,
That is filled with good Household Beer.
At dinner, he sits him down to eat
With good hard cheese, and bread, or meat;
Then this Bottel he takes up amain,
And drinks; and sets him down again,
Saying, 'Good Bottel, stand my friend,
And hold out till this day doth end!'
For I wish in heaven his soul may dwell
That first found out the Leather Bottel.

And likewise the Haymakers, they
Whenas they are turning and making their
hay,

In summer weather, whenas it is warm,
A good Bottel-full then will do them no
harm.

And at noon-time they sit them down
To drink in their Bottels of Ale nut-brown.
Then the lads and the lasses begin to tattle,
'What should we do but for this Bottel?'
They could not work if this Bottel were
done;

For the day's so hot, with heat of the sun.
Then I wish in heaven his soul may dwell
That first found out the Leather Bottel.

And when this Bottel doth grow old,
And will good liquor no longer hold.
Out of the side you may take a clout
Will mend your shoes, when they're worn
out.

Else take it and hang it upon a pin;
'Twill serve to put many odd trifles in,
As hinges, awls, and candle-ends:
For young beginners must have such things.
Then I wish in heaven his soul may dwell
That first found out the Leather Bottel.

JOHN WADE.

utrem quisquis repperit primus potatorum
semper opto sedeat in choro deorum.
uter ego maximis laudibus te digno,
gratiorem vitreis, gratiorem ligno.
nihil iuvant cetera virum sitientem,
sive rus arantem, seu sarculis findentem:
utrem coriaceum adhibe cum vino,
ut, dum siccus maximum poculum propino,
recreetur spiritus consolatione:
quare securissimus utrem tu appone.
utrem quisquis repperit primus potatorum
semper opto sedeat in choro deorum.
iam qui tondent segetes strenui messorum,
possint quo defendere nesciant calores,
ni defessis improbi praesto sit laboris
uter cum domestici copia liquoris.
ubi mox consumpserit cibum matutinum,
carnem, durum caseum, panem genuinum,
arripit continuo utrem, ducit potum,
dum reponit angulo prope se admotum,
'Uter' inquit 'tu mihi sis amicus cura,
profluens ad vesperum serum tu perdura.'
qui te fecit igitur primus potatorum
semper ille sedeat in choro Deorum.
ipsi quin faeniseci faenum iactitanti,
huc illuc per pascua furculis versanti,
per aestiva tempora dies dum calebit,
modica potatio, credo, non nocebit.
dumque post meridiem gramine supini
potant aliquantulum rutilantis vini,
rogat alter alterum puer ac puella,
'absque hoc quid fieret nobis!' fit loquella.
nam sub Iove fervido, Sirio torrente,
hominum opuscula irent lente lente.
utrem quisquis repperit primus potatorum
semper opto sedeat in choro deorum.
At detricto corio cum senescet idem,
neque vinum integrum capiet iam pridem,
copiam invenies hinc panniculorum
quis hiulca sarcias fissa calceorum;
aut in muro, si voles, tu suspende ventis,
ut sit receptaculum nugis ac ramentis,
quo recondas subulas, cardines, candelas,
quae si quis desiderat efferet querellas.
qui te fecit igitur primus potatorum
semper ille sedeat in choro deorum.

W. H. D. ROUSE.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Publishers and Authors forwarding Books for review are asked to send at the same time a note of the price.

The size of Books is given in inches: 4 inches = 10 centimetres (roughly). They are unbound unless the binding is specified.

**.* Excerpts and Extracts from Periodicals and Collections are not included in these Lists unless stated to be separately published.*

- Aeschylus.* Eitrem (Dr. S.) Aischylos, populaere forelaesninger over Graekernes Aeldste Drama. 7 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 5 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. 270. Kristiania, H. Aschehong and Co. (W. Nygaard).
- Aristophanes.* Four plays (the Acharnians, the Knights, the Birds, the Frogs), translated into English Verse by John Hookham Frere, with an introduction by W. W. Merry, D.D. (*The World's Classics CXXXIV*) 6" x 4". Pp. xxii + 358. Henry Frowde. 1907. Art Cloth. 1s. net.
- Arrian.* Flavii Arriani quae exstant omnia edidit A. G. Roos. Volumen I. Alexandri Anabasin continens, accedit tabula phototypica. (*Bibl. Script. Gr. et Rom. Teub.*) 7 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. liv + 426. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 1907. M. 3.20.
- Atti del Congresso Internazionale di Scienze Storiche.* (Roma, 1-9 Aprile, 1903.) Volume I. Parte Generale. 10 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. x + 324. Rome, E. Loescher & Co. 1907. Lire 10.
- Ausfeld* (Adolf.) Der griechische Alexanderroman von A. A. (nach des Verfassers Tode herausgegeben von Wilhelm Kroll). 9" x 6". Pp. xii + 254. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 1907. M. 8.
- Barone* (Dott. Mario) Sull' uso dell' Aoristo nel ΠΕΡΙ ΤΗΣ ΑΝΤΙΔΟΞΕΩΣ di Isocrate con una introduzione intorno al significato fondamentale dell' Aoristo Greco. 9 $\frac{3}{8}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 110. Roma. Tipographia della R. Accademia dei Lincei. 1907.
- Birt* (Theodor) Die Buchrolle in der Kunst. Archäologisch-Antiquarische Untersuchungen zum antiken Buchwesen. 9 $\frac{3}{8}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. x + 352, mit 190 Abb. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 1907. M. 12.
- British Museum.* Greek Papyri in the British Museum. Facsimiles. Vol. III. 100 Plates (20" x 15") in Portfolio. Oxford, University Press. 1907. £3 3s.
- Brugmann* (K.) Die Distributiven und die Kollektiven Numeralia der indogermanischen Sprachen. (*Abhandl. d. K. S. Gesellsch. d. Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse. XXV. v.*) mit einem Anhang von Eduard Sievers. 11 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 80. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 1907. M. 3.60.
- Buchanan* (George) A Memorial, 1506-1906. Contributions by various writers, compiled and edited by D. A. Millar (on behalf of the Executive of the Students' Representative Council of St. Andrews University). 9" x 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. xx + 490. St. Andrews, W. C. Henderson & Son. London, D. Nutt. 1907. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Burrows* (Ronald M.) The Discoveries in Crete and their bearing on the History of Ancient Civilization. 9" x 5 $\frac{3}{8}$ ". Pp. xvi + 244, with illustrations. London, John Murray. 1907. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Caesar.* C. Iuli Caesaris de bello Gallico liber vii, edited by W. H. D. Rouse, Litt.D. (*Blackie's Latin Texts.*) 7 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xii + 56. London, Blackie & Son. 1907. Linen, 6d. net.
- Cauer* (Paul) ΟΜΗΡΟΥ ΙΛΙΑΣ. Homeri Ilias. Schulausgabe von P. C. Teil I. A-M. Zweiter Abdruck der zweiten, berichtigten und durch Beigaben vermehrten Auflage. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5". Pp. 268. Teil II. N-Ω. Zweiter Abdruck, etc. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5". Pp. 392. Leipzig, G. Freytag; Wien, F. Tempsky. 1907. Cloth, Teil I. M. 1.80 or 2 K. 20. Teil II. M. 2.50 or K. 3.
- Christ* (A. Th.) and Levegghi (Leonardo) Odissea di Omero, edizione abbreviata di A. Th. C. Adattata ai Ginnasi Italiani sulla iv edizione Tedesca da L. L. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5". Pp. xxxii + 336, con un' effigie di Omero, 16 incisioni ed una carta. Vienna, F. Tempsky. 1907. Cloth, M. 3 or K. 3.
- Cicero.* De M. Tulli Ciceronis studiis rhetoricis thesim Facultati Litterarum Universitatis Parisiensis proponebat L. Laurand. 9" x 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. xxii + 116. Paris, Alphonse Picard & Fils. 1907. Fr. 3.
- Davidson* (William L.) The Stoic Creed. (*Religion in Literature and Life.*) 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. xxiv + 274. Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark. 1907. Cloth, 4s. 6d. net.
- Demosthenes against Conon and Callicles.* Edited with notes, appendices, and vocabulary by F. Darwin Swift, M.A. Second edition, revised. 7" x 4 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. viii + 64. London, Methuen & Co. 1907. Cloth, 2s.
- Demosthenes.* Philippics I, II, III, with introduction and notes by Gilbert A. Davies, M.A. (*Pitt Press Series.*) 7" x 4 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. xxxvi + 126. Cambridge, University Press. 1907. Cloth, 2s. 6d.
- Eranos: Acta Philologica Suecana.* Ed. W. Lundström. Uppsala, published by the Editor. 8 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. 152.
- Euripides.* The Heraclidae, edited by A. C. Pearson, M.A. (*Pitt Press Series.*) 7" x 4 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. xl + 166. Cambridge, University Press. 1907. Cloth, 3s. 6d.
- Freeman* (Kenneth J.) Schools of Hellas. An Essay on the practice and theory of ancient Greek education from 600 to 300 B.C. by K. J. F., edited by M. J. Rendall, with a preface by A. W. Verrall, Litt.D. 9" x 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. xviii + 300. Illustrated. London, Macmillan & Co. 1907. Cloth, 4s. net.
- Gerth* (Prof. Dr. Bernhard) Griechische Schulgrammatik. Achte Auflage. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. iv. + 204. Leipzig, G. Freytag. 1907. Cloth, M. 2.50.
- Griechische Lyriker in Auswahl für den Schulgebrauch* herausgegeben von Prof. Dr. A. Biese. II. Einleitung und Erläuterungen. Zweite, verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. 100.

- Leipzig, G. Freytag; Wien, F. Tempsky. 1906. Cloth, M. 1.20 Pf. or K. 1.50.
- (Die) *Griechische und lateinische Literatur und Sprache* von U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, K. Krumbacher, J. Wackernagel, Fr. Leo, E. Norden, F. Skutsch. Zweite verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage. (*Die Kultur der Gegenwart*, herausgegeben von Paul Hinneberg. I. viii.) 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 7". Pp. viii + 494. Berlin und Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 1907. Cloth, M. 12.
- Gudemann (Alfred) Grundriss der Geschichte der klassischen Philologie. 8 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. vi + 224. Leipzig und Berlin, B. G. Teubner. 1907. M. 4.80.
- Herodot. Scheindler (August) Auswahl für den Schulgebrauch. Teil I. Text. Zweite durchgesehene Auflage in neuer Rechtschreibung. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5". Pp. viii + 262, mit 1 Titelbilde und 5 Karten. Leipzig, G. Freytag; Wien, F. Tempsky. Cloth, M. 1.60 or K. 2.
- Hirzel (Rudolf). Themis, Dike und Verwandtes. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Rechtsidee bei den Griechen. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. vi + 446. Leipzig, S. Hirzel. 1907. M. 10, geb. M. 11.50.
- Horace. Horaz Iamben- und Sermonen-Dichtung. Vollständig in heimischen Versformen verdeutscht von Karl Staedler. 8 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. viii + 206. Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung. 1907. M. 3.
- Die Sermonen des Q. Horatius Flaccus. Deutsch von C. Bardt. Dritte vermehrte Auflage. 7 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. viii + 258. Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung. 1907. M. 4.
- Q. *Horatius Flaccus* für den Schulgebrauch herausgegeben von O. Keller und J. H. Häussner. Dritte erweiterte Auflage. 7 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 5". Pp. xlvi + 326, mit 2 Abb. und 3 Karten. Leipzig, G. Freytag; Wien, F. Tempsky. 1907. Cloth, M. 2. K. 2.40.
- Horatius Romanus*. Horatii Romani Porcaria seu de conjuratione Stephani Porcarii carmen cum aliis ejusdem quae inveniri poterunt carminibus primum edidit ac praefatus est Maximilianus Lehnerdt. Accedit Petri de Godis Vincentini de conjuratione porcaria dialogus. (*Bibl. Script. Medii Aevi. Teub.*) 7 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. xviii + 78. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 1907. M. 1.20.
- Huguet (Edmond) Petit Glossaire des classiques français du dix-septième siècle, contenant les mots et locutions qui ont vieilli ou dont le sens s'est modifié. 8" x 5". Pp. viii + 410. Paris, Librairie Hachette et Cie. 1907. Fr. 5.
- Jebb (Sir Richard C.) Essays and Addresses. 8 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. vi + 648. Cambridge, University Press. 1907. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- See also *Sophocles*.
- Kiehr (F.) *Lesbonactis Sophistae quae supersunt ad fidem librorum manuscriptorum edidit et commentariis instruxit Fridericus Kiehr: accedit tabula phototypica*. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 6". Pp. 62. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 1907. M. 2.
- Kuhnla (R. C.) Alkmans Partheneion. Ein Beitrag zum Iakonischen Artemiskulte. (*Sonderdruck aus Philologus LXVI.*) 9" x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 32. Leipzig, Dieterische Verlagsbuchhandlung. 1907. Pf. 80.
- Laurand (L.) Études sur le style des discours de Cicéron, avec une esquisse de l'histoire du 'Cursus.' 8 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 5". Pp. xl + 388. Paris, Librairie Hachette. 1907. Fr. 7.50.
- Levander (F. W.) *Memorabilia Latina*. Selected notes on Latin Grammar. New edition, revised. 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. 72. London, George Bell & Sons. 1907. Linen, 1s.
- Lindsay (W. M.) Syntax of Plautus. (*St. Andrews University Publications, No. IV.*) 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. iv + 138. Oxford, James Parker & Co. 1907.
- Löffstedt (Einar) Beiträge zur Kenntnis der späteren Latinität. (Inaugural-Dissertation.) Uppsala. 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. 130. Stockholm, O. L. Svanbäck. 1907.
- Lucian. Lucianus edidit Nils Nilén. Vol. I, Fasc. 1. Libelli i-xiv. (*Bibl. Script. Gr. et Rom. Teub.*) 7 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. lxxvi + 208. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 1907. M. 2.80.
- Lucianus edidit Nils Nilén. Prolegomenon P. 1^a-72^a. (*Bibl. Script. Gr. et Rom. Teub.*) 7 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 1907. M. 1.
- Martial. One hundred and twenty selected Epigrams metrically rendered into English by A. E. Street. 7 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 5". Pp. 122. Eton College, Spottiswoode & Co. 1907. Paper boards, 2s. 6d. net.
- Masqueray (P.) and Pressler (Dr. Phil. Br.) Abriss der griechischen Metrik von P. M. Ins deutsche übersetzt von Dr. Phil. Br. P. 7" x 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xii + 244. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 1907. Geheftet, M. 4.40, Gebunden, M. 5.
- Minne (John Stewart) Surgical Instruments in Greek and Roman times. 9" x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ " Pp. xii + 188, and 54 Plates. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1907. Cloth, 14s. net.
- Mouret (Félix) Sulpice Sévère a Primuliac. 10" x 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. 236. Fifteen plates. Paris, Picard & Fils. 1907. Fr. 7.50.
- Nilsson (Martin P.) Die Kausalsätze im griechischen bis Aristoteles. I. Die Poesie. (*Beiträge zur historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache*, herausgegeben von M. v. Schanz. Heft. 18.) 10" x 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. 146. Würzburg, A. Stuber's Verlag (Curt Kabitzsch). 1907. M. 5.50.
- Nissen (Theodore) Lateinische Satzlehre für Reformanstalten. 9" x 6". Pp. 132. Leipzig, G. Freytag; Wien, F. Tempsky. 1907. Cloth, M. 1.80.
- Oliver (Edmund Henry) Roman Economic Conditions. (*University of Toronto Studies. History and Economics.*) 10 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 7". Pp. xvi + 200. University of Toronto Library. 1907. \$1.50.
- Orange (B.) *Dona Reginae and other Latin Scenes for acting*. 6" x 3 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". London, Blackie & Son. 1907. 4d.
- Papyrus Greco. Publ. sous la direction de Pierre Jouguet. I. 1. Institut Papyrologique de l'université de Lille. 11" x 9". Pp. iv + 66. Paris, Leroux. 1907.
- Philodemus. Philodemi Περὶ Οἰκονομίας qui dicitur libellus edidit Christianus Jensen. (*Bibl. Script. Gr. et Rom. Teub.*) 7 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. xxxiv + 106, and 2 Plates. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 1907. M. 2.40.
- Plautus. T. Macci Plauti Mostellaria, edited with notes explanatory and critical by Edward A.

- Sonnenschein, D. Litt. Second Edition. 7" x 4½". Pp. xxii + 176, text interleaved. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1907. Cloth, 4s. 6d. (\$1.10).
- The Menaechmi of Plautus. The Latin Text with an English Verse translation by Benjamin Bickley Rogers, M.A. 8½" x 7". Pp. 173-210. London, George Bell & Sons. 1907. 1s. 6d.
- Prescott (H. W.) Some Phases of the relation of thought to verse in Plautus. Univ. of Chicago Publications. Berkeley, The University Press. 10½" x 7". Pp. 205-262.
- Quintilianus. M. Fabi Quintiliani institutionis oratoriae libri xii edidit Ludovicus Rademacher. Pars prior libros i-iv continens. (Bibl. Script. Gr. et Rom. Teub.) 7¼" x 4¾". Pp. xiv + 360. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 1907. M. 3.
- Reik (Dr. Karl) Der Optativ bei Polybios und Philo von Alexandria. 9" x 6¼". Pp. xii + 198. Leipzig, Gustav Fock, G. N. B. H. 1907. M. 3.50.
- Reitzenstein (R.) Der Anfang des Lexikons des Photios herausgegeben von R. R. 9½" x 6½". Pp. liv + 166, mit 2 Tafeln in Lichtdruck. Leipzig und Berlin, B. G. Teubner. 1907. M. 7.
- Richards (Herbert) Notes on Xenophon and others. 7¾" x 5". Pp. xii + 358. London, E. Grant Richards. 1907. Cloth, 6s. net.
- Sanctis (Gaetano de) Storia dei Romani. Volumes I and II. La conquista del Primato in Italia. (Biblioteca di Scienze Moderne. Nos. 32 and 33.) 9¾" x 6¼". Pp. xii + 458; pp. viii + 576. Torino, Fratelli Bocca. 1907. 2 vols. Lire 24.
- Sander (Julius) Schülerkommentar zu Vergils Aeneis in Auswahl. Für den Schulgebrauch von J. S. 7½" x 5". Pp. 172. Leipzig, G. Freytag; Wien, F. Tempsky. 1906. Cloth, M. 1.50 or K. 1.80.
- Schneider (R.) Geschützte auf handschriftlichen Bildern. 10" x 8". Pp. 72, 5 Plates. Metz, Scriba. 1907.
- Sophocles. The Ajax of Sophocles with a commentary abridged from the larger edition of Sir Richard C. Jebb, Litt. D., by A. C. Pearson, M.A. 7½" x 5". Pp. xlviii + 208. Cambridge, University Press. 1907. Cloth, 4s.
- Sophokles erklärt von F. W. Schneidewin und A. Nauck. Philoktetes. Zehnte Auflage besorgt von Ludwig Rademacher. (Sammlung Griech. und Latein. Schriftsteller mit deutschen Anmerkungen, begründet von M. Haupt und H. Sauppe) 8¼" x 5¼". Pp. iv + 154. Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung. 1907. M. 1.80.
- Usener (Hermann) Vorträge und Aufsätze. 8¾" x 5¾". Pp. vi + 260. Leipzig und Berlin, B. G. Teubner. 1907. M. 5.
- Vahlen. Johannis Vahleni professoris Berolinensis Opuscula Academica. Pars prior, Prooemia indicibus lectionum praemissa i-xxxiii ab A. MDCCCLXXV ad A. MDCCCLXXXI. 9¼" x 6". Pp. xii + 512. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 1907. M. 12.
- Vergil. Appendix Vergiliana sive Carmina minora Vergilio adtributa recog. et adnot. critica instruxit R. Ellis. (Script. Class. Bibl. Oxon.) 7½" x 4¾". Pp. xvi + 126 (?). Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1907. Paper, 3s. 6d. Cloth, 4s.
- Virgil. Auswahl aus Vergils Äneis. Nach den Bestimmungen der neuen Lehrpläne für den Schulgebrauch herausg. von Dr. Adolf Lange. Vierte, durchgesehene Auflage. Teil I. Text. Teil II. Anmerkungen. (Griechische und lateinische Schulschriftsteller mit Anmerkungen). 8" x 5". Teil I. Pp. viii + 170. Teil II. Pp. 124. Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung. 1906. Cloth. M. 1.80 and M. 1.60 respectively.
- P. Vergili Maronis Georgicon liber tertius, liber quartus, edited by S. E. Winbolt, M.A. (Blackie's Latin Texts.) 7¼" x 4¾". Pp. xvi + 37-56; pp. xvi + 57-75. London, Blackie. 1907. Linen, each 6d. net.
- Vürtheim (J.) De Ajacis Origine, Cultu, Patria scripsit J. V.: accedunt commentationes tres de Amazonibus, de Carneis, de Telegonia. 9¾" x 6¼". Pp. 228. Lugduni Batavorum, apud A. W. Sijthoff. 1907.
- Wageningen (Jacobus van) Album Terentianum picturas continens ex imagine phototypa Lugdunensi Terentii codd. Ambrosiani H 75 et Parisini 7899 sumptas et lithographice expressas. 15" x 10¾". Pp. lxxxviii. Gröningen, P. Noordhoff. 1907. Paper boards, M. 6.
- Scaenica Romana scripsit J. van W. 10¾" x 7½". Pp. 68. Gröningen, P. Noordhoff. 1907. M. 1.70.
- Wilhelm (Adolf) Urkunden dramatischer Aufführungen in Athen. 11½" x 9". Pp. 280, 68 cuts in text. Wien, Holder. Paper boards, M. 16.
- Ziegler (Konrat) Die Überlieferungsgeschichte der vergleichenden Lebensbeschreibungen Plutarchs. 9" x 6". Pp. viii + 208, mit einer Tafel. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 1907. M. 6.